



JX 1932
.L 19
1896-1902



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

REPORT

OF THE

EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

✓ LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE

ON

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

1902

REPORTED BY WILLIAM J. ROSE

PUBLISHED BY
THE LAKE MOHONK ARBITRATION CONFERENCE

1902

LAKE MOHONK ARBITRATION CONFERENCE.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, 1902.

President: HON. JOHN W. FOSTER, Washington.

Secretaries: CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF, Philadelphia; W. C. DENNIS, Lake Mohonk.

Stenographer: W. J. ROSE, Boston.

Treasurer: ALEXANDER C. WOOD, Camden, N. J.

Auditors: JOHN B. GARRETT, Rosemont, Pa.; OSCAR LAPHAM, Providence, R. I.

Business Committee: HON. JOHN I. GILBERT, Malone, N. Y., *Chairman*; JOHN CROSBY BROWN, New York; JUDGE ALDEN CHESTER, Albany; HON. WILLIAM J. COOMBS, Brooklyn; R. FULTON CUTTING, New York; WILLIAM F. KING, New York; OSCAR LAPHAM, Providence, R. I.; EDWIN D. MEAD, Boston; GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY, New York; PRESIDENT L. C. SEELYE, Northampton, Mass.; DANIEL SMILEY, Lake Mohonk; JAMES TALCOTT, New York; BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Boston; JAMES WOOD, Mt. Kisco, N. Y.; CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF, Philadelphia.

Permanent Executive Committee: The President and the Business Committee.

Publication Committee: BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Boston, *Chairman*; WILLIAM C. DENNIS, Lake Mohonk; ALEXANDER C. WOOD, Camden, N. J.

Press Committee: WILLIAM C. DENNIS, Lake Mohonk, *Chairman*; LA SALLE A. MAYNARD, New York; CHARLES G. TRUMBULL, Philadelphia.

Finance Committee: JOHN B. GARRETT, Rosemont, Pa., *Chairman*; CHARLES RICHARDSON, Philadelphia; WILLIAM O. BLANEY, Boston; HON. S. R. THAYER, Minneapolis; J. EDWARD SIMMONS, New York; FRANCIS B. REEVES, Philadelphia.

PREFACE.

The Eighth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration was held, on the invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Albert K. Smiley, at the Lake Mohonk House, Ulster County, N. Y., May 28, 29 and 30, 1902, and was attended by more than two hundred persons. There were six sessions of the Conference. This Report contains the stenographic account of the proceedings, which consisted of addresses and discussions on the history of arbitration, the Hague permanent court and the means of bringing it into general operation, the relations of commerce and industry to peace, the best methods of promoting public opinion in favor of arbitration, and kindred topics.

One copy of this Report is sent to each member of the Conference. If other copies are desired, application should be made to Mr. Smiley.

THE EIGHTH LAKE MOHONK ARBITRATION CONFERENCE.

First Session.

Wednesday Morning, May 28, 1902.

The Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration met for its eighth annual session, by invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Albert K. Smiley, in the parlor of the Lake Mohonk Mountain House, on the 28th day of May, 1902, at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Smiley, in opening the Conference, said :

MR. SMILEY : It is with the greatest pleasure that I welcome you to this Eighth Annual Conference on International Arbitration. It is a glad day for me to see so many people interested in a cause in which I have always felt the deepest interest, and to have them come to hear able men and women from various parts of the country. It is a hopeful day. I never felt more hopeful about the world coming to the settlement of its difficulties by arbitration than I do to-day. My hope has grown greatly since last year. Events have transpired which make it a reasonable hope, as you may judge for yourselves when you hear some of the matters that will be presented this morning.

We have taken great pains, in selecting the men and women to invite to this Conference, to get representative men, business men, men of affairs, men occupying leading positions in the world. We hope to hear from a large number of them, and to get the benefit of their wise counsels.

We want to organize this morning. It is very important for us to have a man to preside who will command the confidence of the country ; we want the foremost man in the country, and we have got him. We have a man who held the foremost place in the Cabinet of President Harrison, that of Secretary of State ; who has been Minister to Mexico, to Russia and to Spain, and who has always been consulted about questions of arbitration. He is now on the commission to settle the trouble about the Canadian border. What pleases me most in connection with his history is this, that when the Emperor of China wanted some one to advise him in arranging terms of peace between his country and Japan at the close of the war seven years ago, this gentleman was selected for that duty in preference to any other man in the world. He is decidedly the foremost

man in America, if not in the world, on matters relating to international arbitration, and it gives me very great pleasure to present to you Hon. John W. Foster.

On taking the chair Mr. Foster was received with great applause, and spoke as follows :

OPENING ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN W. FOSTER.

Ladies and Gentlemen : I was quite surprised when I was asked to preside over this Conference. It has been my misfortune never before to have been able to attend its sessions, and it seemed appropriate that some one familiar with its order of procedure and well acquainted with its members should have been called to the honorable post of its President. I am not, however, entirely without knowledge of its work, as I have been a diligent reader of its published proceedings and am in entire sympathy with its objects.

I have been informed that it is expected that I should make some remarks by way of an introductory address. It has occurred to me that a brief reference to some of the events that have taken place since you last met, having relation to arbitration, may not be out of place, and that particular interest would attach to those occurring in our own country and hemisphere.

The event of the greatest moment, doubtless, was the assembling of representatives from all the independent nations of the Americas in the city of Mexico. It is an occasion for congratulation by all the friends of peace when such a body of public men meet together to consider their mutual interests and duties. It would be profitable to have a full review of the deliberations and acts of that conference, but I can only allude to its conclusions respecting arbitration.

The delegates from the majority of the states represented were in favor of a plan of compulsory arbitration, but it was not possible to secure unanimous action to that end, and through the influence of the delegates from the United States the Congress was brought to a harmonious agreement to give their adhesion to the Hague Arbitration Convention. Some criticism has been passed upon our government for not lending its support to the plan of obligatory arbitration, but it is hardly well founded in view of the action of the Senate on the Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Convention, and of the desirability of avoiding a disruption of the Congress and of securing harmonious action.

Ten of the nineteen nations represented at the conference, however, united in the project of a treaty, to be ratified by their respective governments, providing for obligatory arbitration of all controversies which, in the judgment of any of the interested nations, do not affect either their independence or national honor; and it is prescribed that in independence and national honor are not included controversies concerning diplomatic privileges, limits,

rights of navigation, or the validity, interpretation and fulfilment of treaties.

Another important event was the meeting together of four of the presidents of the Central American republics, which resulted in the signing of a treaty in January last submitting to arbitration "every difficulty or question that might present itself." The president of Guatemala did not participate in the meeting, but has since given his approval to the convention. A special tribunal is created and rules laid down for its procedure. The convention only awaits the approval of the congresses of the respective governments to put it in operation. There has been in the past much ill-feeling and sometimes wars between the republican family of states in Central America, and the realization of this treaty will be a great step in the direction of peace on this continent.

The two enlightened and progressive republics at the extreme of South America, Chile and Argentina, after maintaining for some time strained relations, with hostilities quite imminent, have wisely decided to refer the question in dispute to arbitration, and the danger of war happily is passed. The papers of this morning announce that the two nations have just united in a treaty for obligatory arbitration and arrest of armaments.

During the past year our own government has not been behind her neighbors in cultivating the spirit of arbitration. The exercise of its good offices in bringing about an agreement on the subject in the Pan-American Congress has already been noticed. Two of the conventions agreed upon at the Hague Conference were not signed by the delegates from the United States, not because of any objection to their provisions, but it was thought best to leave them to the further consideration of our government. These were the conventions concerning the laws and customs of war on land, and for the adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of the Geneva Convention of 1864. Upon full consideration, the President submitted them to the Senate, and that body has recently approved them without opposition, thus placing us in the advance line of the nations favoring peace and the amelioration of the evils of war.

Secretary Hay, acting in consistency with the acceptance of the Hague Convention, provided in the recent treaty for the cession of the Danish Islands that all questions which might arise under the treaty, not possible of diplomatic settlement, should be submitted to the Hague tribunal. We are also informed through the press that he has within the last few days completed an agreement with the government of Mexico for submission of a large claim to that tribunal for adjudication. It is a matter of pride for us as Americans to know that, so far as I am informed, the nations first to resort to this great international court have been the two neighboring and leading republics of this hemisphere.

It is thus seen that a notable advance has been made on this side of the globe since you last met to consider the subject of arbitration among nations. While we have cause for congratulation, we

should not allow our enthusiasm to carry us too far. There yet exists in the United States a strong opposition to unrestricted arbitration. That such is the case is indicated in the terms of the Olney-Pauncefote treaty of 1897, a convention which was the product of two wise and experienced statesmen, who desired to go as far as was practical in the way of arbitration. They recognized that there were some subjects for which it was not prudent to provide obligatory arbitration, but which might more properly be referred to commissions of inquiry. The Hague treaty fell short of the hopes of many of the more ardent advocates of the cause, but it is not wise to go too far in advance of public sentiment.

These Mohonk conferences in the past have been of great service in creating and stimulating an enlightened public opinion, and I have no doubt the discussions of the present Conference will be equally improving and profitable.

Mr. Foster closed with a tribute to Lord Pauncefote as the man who had probably done most in his day and generation to promote peace and goodwill between the two great English-speaking nations.

The Conference then proceeded to complete its organization.

Upon motion, Mr. Clinton Rogers Woodruff of Philadelphia and Mr. W. C. Dennis of Lake Mohonk were elected Secretaries.

Upon motion, Mr. Alexander C. Wood of Camden, N. J., was elected Treasurer.

Upon motion, the following Business Committee was elected: Hon. John I. Gilbert, Malone, N. Y.; Hon. Alden Chester, Albany; Hon. William J. Coombs, Brooklyn; Hon. Oscar Lapham, Providence, R. I.; Mr. Daniel Smiley, Lake Mohonk; Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, Boston; Mr. Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Philadelphia; Mr. George Foster Peabody, New York City; Mr. Edwin D. Mead, Boston; Mr. R. Fulton Cutting, New York City; President L. C. Seelye, Northampton, Mass.; Mr. John Crosby Brown, New York City; Mr. James Wood, Mt. Kisco, N. Y.; Mr. James Talcott, New York City; and Mr. W. F. King, New York City.

Upon motion, the following Finance Committee was elected: Mr. John B. Garrett, Rosemont, Pa.; Mr. Charles Richardson, Philadelphia; Mr. William O. Blaney, Boston; Hon. S. R. Thayer, Minneapolis; Mr. J. Edward Simmons, New York City; and Mr. Francis B. Reeves, Philadelphia.

Upon motion, the following Press Committee was elected: William C. Dennis, Lake Mohonk; La Salle A. Maynard, New York; Charles G. Trumbull, Philadelphia.

Upon motion, Mr. William J. Rose of Boston was elected stenographer of the Conference.

Upon motion, Mr. John B. Garrett and Mr. Oscar Lapham were elected a committee to audit the Treasurer's report.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will read a resolution which has been prepared by the Business Committee:

Resolved, That the discussions of the Conference be confined to the affirmative side of international arbitration, and that references to pending national and international difficulties be excluded.

We have been invited by our host to come together and consider the subject of international arbitration, and nothing else, and I feel sure that none of us will commit the breach of courtesy of violating the spirit of that invitation.

The Chairman then announced the subject for the morning to be "The Progress and Present Outlook of Arbitration," and introduced Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood of Boston as the first speaker.

ADDRESS OF DR. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

THE PROGRESS AND PRESENT OUTLOOK OF ARBITRATION.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Conference: I find myself somewhat embarrassed this morning, because I have been invited to say over again some of the things which I have said in former conferences. I consent to do this, not from the desire of repeating, but because it has been suggested that there might be people here who did not know as much as they would like to know about the history and progress of the cause of arbitration.

A hundred years ago there had been no cases of arbitration between nations of any special significance, though the principle had been acted upon in minor ways for centuries; in fact, back to the beginning of the Christian era and earlier. But, commencing with the last century, arbitration was organized gradually into a settled policy, which was followed with increasing frequency as the century progressed. In the second decade of the century there were but two or three cases of international dispute settled by this method; in the third decade there were about five; and from that time on until the close of the century the number of cases increased, until during the last decade, as I said last year, there were more than sixty cases of controversy between nations settled by arbitration, or an average of more than six a year for the whole ten years.

The entire number of cases settled in this way during the past century was about two hundred. Some of these were more and some less important. Something like a hundred of these were settled by specially appointed tribunals of the regular order; a less number were adjusted by joint commissions, in which the principle of arbitration is involved. Thirty-seven nations participated in these two hundred cases; the United States and Great Britain taking the lead, with more than fifty cases each.

Before the middle of last century a movement was begun, both in this country and Great Britain, for legislative action in approval of the general principle of arbitration in disputes between nations. That movement grew in strength up to the close of the century, when the United States and practically all of the constitutional governments of Western Europe had passed resolutions by their parliaments in favor of the general use of the method of arbitration.

A number of organizations have for many years been laboring for the general adoption of arbitration and the setting up of a permanent international tribunal. Two of the most important of these — two which have worked in the quietest way — are the Institute of International Law and the International Law Association. The latter was founded through the influence of our own fellow countrymen, Dr. James B. Miles and Elihu Burritt, and its first president was the distinguished David Dudley Field, at that time the head of the American bar. These two organizations have done a great deal to develop interest among lawyers and jurists in the cause of international arbitration. Only last year the International Law Association held a very important meeting in Glasgow, which was presided over by the Chief Justice of Great Britain, Lord Alverstone, and one entire session was devoted to the consideration of international arbitration.

In addition to this, the peace congresses which have been held for the last thirteen years have given much attention to the question of arbitration, and the Interparliamentary Peace Union, composed entirely of members of parliaments — the most important unofficial body of public men in the world — has given its almost exclusive attention for the last decade to this matter. Then there have been special arbitration conferences, like the series of which we are just entering upon the eighth here at Lake Mohonk; the National Arbitration Conference held at Washington in April, 1896; various conferences in Europe of a similar kind, — one held last year in Scandinavia, at which there were nearly a hundred delegates from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden; national and local conferences in Great Britain, France, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, etc.

The story of the past year can be very easily told. It is a very important and encouraging one. I may begin the account of the year by saying that there are now pending before tribunals or commissions more than a dozen cases of arbitration. The more important of these are as follows:

The United States, Great Britain and Germany, over the claims for damages during the Samoan troubles.

The United States and Russia, over the seizure of some American sealing vessels.

The United States and Salvador, over the claims of the Salvadorian Commercial Company; just disposed of.

Great Britain and Brazil, over the British Guiana-Brazilian boundary question.

Chile and the Argentine Republic, over their boundary.

Italy and Peru, over the interpretation of Article 10 in the commercial treaty between them. (I may say, by way of parenthesis, that one of the most important phases of the arbitration movement in the last twenty-five years has been the insertion in treaties of nearly every type of a clause to the effect that any difficulties that may arise about the interpretation of the treaty shall be referred to arbitration.)

Great Britain and Germany, over the "Hinterland" of Togoland in Africa.

Great Britain and France, over the Sergeant Malamine and Waima affairs.

Great Britain and France, over the Ivory and Gold Coasts in Western Africa.

Bolivia and Peru, all pending questions.

France and Chile, over the guano dispute.

Great Britain and Turkey, over the Aden "Hinterland."

The United States and Mexico, over the "Pious Fund."

Great Britain and Italy, over the Soudan Erythrean frontier.

This list is most significant as indicating how generally at the present time all ordinary international difficulties as they arise are referred in a quiet and simple way to boards of arbitration or to commissions. It indicates that our cause is much more nearly won than many people suppose.

The Hague Court, which was announced at our Conference last year to have just been definitively organized and declared ready for business, has been making steady progress during the year. Last year sixteen nations had appointed their members of this Court,—about fifty-two members in all. Since our last meeting five more of the signatory powers have appointed their members, until now twenty-one of the twenty-six governments represented at The Hague have made their nominations, and there are now sixty-seven members of the international tribunal, —perhaps as able a body of public men, jurists, international lawyers, publicists, as could be found in the civilized world. We all regret that two of the persons considered among the ablest men in the Court have since deceased, one of whom was our own distinguished ex-President Harrison. Mr. Harrison's place has been filled by a very able diplomat, Mr. Oscar S. Strauss, ex-Minister to Turkey.

Two treaties have been drawn during the year recognizing the Hague Court. Our Chairman has referred to one of these, the treaty between this country and Denmark for the cession of the Danish West Indies, ratified by our country, but not yet by Denmark. The other treaty is one between Germany and the Netherlands in reference to the laying of cables in the Pacific affecting their colonies. The two governments have agreed to refer any difficulties that may arise about that treaty to the Hague Court.

The United States and Mexico, as Mr. Foster has told us, have agreed to refer the celebrated "Pious Fund" case to the tribunal at The Hague. Mr. Powell Clayton recently brought with him

from Mexico City the agreement with the Mexican government for that purpose. This case involves something more than a million dollars. It arose out of the cession of California to this country at the close of the Mexican War in 1847, and has been pending ever since. We may all congratulate ourselves as Americans that the United States, which has been one of the prime movers in the arbitration cause, has been one of the two powers first to carry an actual case to the Hague Court. This case is not an important one, as the Alabama affair was, but its reference sets the machinery of the international court in motion, and that is the chief thing just now.

Our Chairman has told us of the action of the Pan-American Congress in Mexico City, which began on October 22 last, and closed on January 31. That conference has carried the arbitration movement beyond what was done at The Hague. The Hague Conference provided for a voluntary tribunal, according to the plan which was often discussed here at Mohonk, in the Interparliamentary Peace Union meetings and in the peace congresses,—a court which was to put out its shingle with the announcement: "International Justice Done Here;" no nation being under treaty obligations to go to it.

The first of the protocols drawn up at Mexico City was one in which all of the American republics decided to adhere to the three Hague conventions. If that treaty should be ratified by the respective governments within the next year or two, as is probable, we shall have in a few years some forty powers represented in the Hague Court. That means that practically the whole surface of the globe and its entire population will participate in the blessings of this great international tribunal. I do not believe that any of us are big enough in mind or heart to begin to appreciate what that means for the future of humanity.

The second protocol was one in which, when ratified, the nineteen American republics will adopt the principle of obligatory arbitration for a certain class of cases. This convention provides for the submission to the Hague Court of all that class of cases arising out of the claims of citizens of one country against another country for damages or indemnity. If that convention is ratified, we shall have a whole class of very annoying disputes—which have often in the past created friction and the conditions which make war easy—go by treaty obligation to the Hague Court. One of the things which this Conference ought now to do, in the logical order of its work, is to use its influence, not merely for the ratification of this Mexican convention, but for the negotiation of similar treaties among all the nations.

The third protocol adopted at the Pan-American Congress was one in which the representatives of ten of the republics agreed to the reference of substantially all their disputes to the Hague Court.

Since the Pan-American Congress closed another important step has been taken. The Spanish Foreign Office instructed its minister

at Mexico City to take advantage of the presence there of the delegates to the Pan-American Congress to negotiate treaties of obligatory arbitration with all the Spanish-speaking republics of the Western world. Some little time ago it was announced from Madrid that nine of those treaties had already been signed and that four more were in progress of negotiation. These treaties provide that the court shall be composed of a chief official of one of the Spanish-American republics, Spaniards or Spanish-Americans. In case of failure to secure a court of that kind, the disputes go to the Hague Court. Here we have the Hague Court again recognized.

This, then, is the present general position of the arbitration movement: There are pending before boards of arbitration more than a dozen cases of controversy of greater or less importance; two hundred disputes have been settled by this means in the past century; the principle of arbitration has been generally approved by the legislatures of the advanced nations; the Hague Court has advanced quite a step over last year; the Pan-American Congress has drafted the three protocols just noticed, and Spain is negotiating with the Spanish-American nations treaties for the obligatory reference to arbitration of disputes that may arise between herself and them.

The question naturally arises: What ought we to do now in view of the present position?

In the first place, it seems to me that our chief attention should be directed for several years to come to bringing the Hague Court into general use. An effort was made last August at the Conference of the International Law Association at Glasgow to bring about the adoption of special treaties of arbitration between nations, like the Olney-Pauncefote Convention. One between Great Britain and France was particularly urged, with a board of arbitrators to consist of Frenchmen and Englishmen. Fortunately, that position was combated very strongly, and it was shown that such a course, by ignoring the Hague Court, would result in great detriment to the cause. The same subject came up in the Peace Congress at Glasgow later in the year, and the position was taken there that everything now done should be directed to giving the Hague Court prestige.

In the second place, we ought to use our influence for the establishment of general treaties of obligatory arbitration between the nations. I am somewhat more optimistic in this direction than our distinguished Chairman. Perhaps, for many years, we shall not succeed in getting general treaties; but if we can get certain classes of cases referred to the Hague Court, by means of limited general treaties, we shall be doing a great service. But we ought to set the highest ideal before us, that of the adjustment of all international controversies by the international tribunal, and work steadily to that end. It is due to ourselves and the cause that we take the highest ground, and then let the world come on after us as fast as practicable. The cause is gaining more rapidly than many suppose, and Mohonk must be careful not to get left behind.

In closing, I venture to suggest an idea which has impressed me

greatly in the last few months. It may seem very impracticable to some of you, but it will do to think about. The question has occurred to me whether the time is not very near when the Mohonk Conference, or some other commanding body, should suggest the appointment of a World Commission by all the governments of the earth for the settlement of all outstanding boundary disputes, and those unsettled boundary questions which have not yet been brought into dispute, throughout the whole world. There are disputes of this kind in South America and in Africa; there is our own Alaska boundary dispute; there are certain to be serious boundary disputes in Asia.

An effort to settle once for all these boundaries would be a species of international coöperation of the highest order. That it is not entirely impracticable may be inferred from what the republics of the Western Hemisphere acting together have accomplished at Mexico City, and what twenty-six powers of the world did at the Hague Conference. If some capable and experienced diplomat, like the Chairman of this Conference, would take up this idea and bring it to the attention of the leading cabinets of the world, it is not impossible that in the near future we might see all these questions of national boundaries disposed of permanently. That would be an accomplishment toward the peace of the world such as has never been seen. It will not do to say that anything is impracticable in these days. Why should not Lake Mohonk get a corner on the world in this respect? If such a Commission should be appointed, and do the work suggested, it would be of the very greatest blessing to the future of humanity. In that event all of the leading nations of the world would be pledged, by their own action, to stand by in the future the boundaries which had been agreed upon, and one of the greatest causes of international friction and misunderstanding would be removed from the realm of international affairs.

I drop this idea this morning for what it is worth. Let us not be afraid of taking advanced ground. Our cause has in view the settlement of all outstanding disputes between nations, and the removing of all causes of dispute. If we could secure the settlement of all these boundaries by such a Commission as is here suggested, or by the Hague Court, if you please, we should have done more to advance permanently the cause of the world's peace than has been done in any other way in modern times.

We began in the Mohonk Conference seven years ago with the general desirability of arbitration; we could get no farther than that. Then we advanced to the discussion for two years of an Anglo-American treaty, and we pushed that as far as we could. Then we took up the subject of a permanent international tribunal, and we hammered at that year after year, until we saw our hope unexpectedly realized. That is what we have been doing at Mohonk. We have said some things here which were impracticable; we have said some which have proved to be more practicable than we thought. We have done something for the promotion of public

sentiment. We have done something for the promotion of legislation. With these new men and women here this year, and so many of the experienced workers of former conferences, it seems to me we ought to go beyond what we have given attention to in the past, and not continue to thresh over the old straw. It is our duty to take advanced positions in the movements of our time, on whose successful issue the future peace and happiness of the world so largely depend.

The Chairman then introduced Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D.D., of Springfield, Mass., who spoke as follows :

ADDRESS OF REV. PHILIP S. MOXOM, D. D.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I think I shall take you into my confidence. I am here under the strictest injunctions from my physician not to open my mouth ; in fact, I have no business to be in this place. However, being one of the weak and erring class that is so conspicuous by its absence from Mohonk, I have yielded to the temptation and the command that I find here. But I am not going to make a speech, so that I can tell my physician — and my wife, who is present, may also tell my physician (who will believe her) — that I did not make a speech, but simply said a few words.

The situation this morning reminds me of a story. If I get the story wrong Dr. Wilkinson will correct me — I know of no one better qualified to correct any one on a story about Webster. The story is that Webster and Choate were opposing counsel in a certain case, and Choate made one of his usual extraordinary, brilliant, eloquent speeches. When he had finished and Webster rose to reply he simply made a plain statement of the facts and the law and sat down. The case went to the jury, and the jury gave their verdict immediately in favor of Webster's client. As they went out, one man who was in the audience said to another, "Wasn't that a magnificent speech of Choate's ; did you ever hear anything so eloquent?" "Yes," said the other, "it was fine, it was magnificent ; but Webster got the case!" "Oh, well," said the first speaker, "of course, he had the facts!" The present case is not exactly similar ; we have had the adequate statement of facts from Dr. Trueblood, and we have had also the eloquence. There seems nothing left for me to do.

When I was in the army — I am somewhat like the clergyman in New Jersey who didn't go to Europe until late in life, and who couldn't forget it, but always spoke of it. There was to be a union meeting in the town where he lived, in the interests of Sabbath observance, and, to avoid the usual reference to Europe, the managers put this clergyman on for the prayer. He was much disappointed at not being asked to speak, but in the course of his prayer

he said: "O Lord, Thou knowest that when Thy servant was in Europe he saw how they desecrated Thy Sabbath." — When I was in the army I was in the cavalry, and spent a great part of my time in marching; that is, in riding when the horse was alive and walking when he was not. When the march was long and tedious they used to bring up the buglers, and these would ride in two sets of fours at the head of the column and play some stirring thing that would inspire all our hearts, and inspire even the horses, and quicken their steps. Well, I suppose the committee have put me on here as a sort of bugler, to quicken the march. But Dr. Trueblood has not only given you all the facts; he has also given you a bugle-call that makes my toot unnecessary.

The subject assigned me is the general one for the morning; that is, "The Present Outlook." I think the outlook is extremely encouraging. I thought so before Dr. Trueblood spoke; I think so still more now. I have confessed my faith more than once in this Conference. I am an optimist because I believe in Almighty God. As Browning sings, and will ever sing, "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world." And in this cause, which has moved so much more rapidly than any of us dreamed, we have another outstanding illustration of that truth.

I shall simply point out some of the signs of the times that appeal particularly to me, and which I therefore judge will appeal to you, that make our hope of a near triumph of the cause for which we are contending reasonable and sure.

The first of these is the very great development of human sympathy; that is, the feeling of mankind for one another and with one another. It runs across all lines of race and nationality with a breadth and force never witnessed before. It has become international and universal. Take, for instance, two illustrations:

The first is the extraordinarily prompt and abundant charity to the distressed in the case of Martinique and St. Vincent. It makes one's cheeks tingle, it makes one's blood leap, to think of the nations, our own government (and God be praised for such a government), and even the unspeakable Turk, stretching out their hands across the sea to feed and clothe and comfort the destitute, — Russia with two hundred and fifty thousand francs, — every nationality responding, almost without appeal, with help for the destitute under that terrible disaster. Well, peoples that have come to sympathize with one another and to help one another in such a way are not going on forever fighting one another. It's the development of a sentiment that will make war impossible.

The second illustration of this point is the interest of peoples in one another, — I mean, in their political fate and fortunes. Now I am delighted that the rule which the Chairman announced at the beginning of this meeting was adopted. It is the right one; it is characteristic of the sanity of this Conference; and I am not going to transgress it. But, entirely apart from the question of our individual views on particular events or particular situations, in the

other hemisphere, or next door to us, or at the antipodes, the fact that to-day no people can sink or be swallowed up without the knowledge and interest and even sympathetic action of other peoples, is very significant. The Rev. Dr. Hawes at Hartford many years ago preached a sermon in which he delivered some very trenchant criticisms on the city government. He did not use any names, but it was on the tip of his tongue to call the name of the mayor of that time; it seemed as if he would. He began: "I refer, I refer," — and then judiciously concluded: "I refer to those to whom I allude." I leave you to draw your own inference, but I call your attention to this fact, which is of immense moral significance. You may call it meddlesomeness; you may call it what you like; but it is a fact that the old-time indifference of nations to one another has gone; and that is a great factor in this movement. Humanity is coming together as never before. The electric cable circling the world is symbolic. There is a nervous connection between the nations to-day, and that connection is becoming arterial, so that, cut where you will, you let out the red blood that comes from one heart.

The second salient sign of the times is the sure decline of individualism. There is a difference between individualism and individuality; the more of the latter we can have the better, but individualism is the "ism" of "every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." We are not losing the element of individuality, but individualism is declining, and the principle of selfish competition is getting some very serious shocks. Within national bounds men are drawing together more and more. Coöperation is working its way, almost involuntarily and unconsciously, into industry and commerce, into religion, into education, and into moral reform. It is crossing the boundaries of nationalities and becoming international, so that we are in the process, as Dr. Trueblood well suggested, of a great international coöperation which by and by will become a world-wide development. That development on the commercial and industrial side is full of promise for us in our particular enterprise here.

The last sign of the times which I shall mention is the distinct development among the people of a sentiment against war as a means of settling international disputes. If you can go back in your mind ten years, if you can go back five years, and compare the sentiment that was then prevalent with the sentiment that is widely prevalent to-day, you will see how vastly the world has moved in this direction. The temper of the people is changing from year to year, and the principle of arbitration, which was pooh-poohed and scoffed at — amiably sometimes, bitterly at other times — as a fool's dream a few years ago, is to-day deliberately considered as something feasible and profitable by multitudes of the common people. It is the sentiment which lays hold of these that after all moves the nations. When *they* are moved it is by the rise into greater prominence and greater power of the moral sentiment.

I think *that* is the most promiseful sign of all. Say what you

please, the moral sentiment has a place of power to-day in business, in social life, in politics, in war, that it has never had previously in the history of the world. It is more than ever important that the statesman to-day should have his ear close to the people, and that he should hearken to the moral voice of the people. I know there are many things that seem to contradict this, but they are superficial compared with the great onward movement. What though there are eddies on the surface and back currents here and there! These will be for a time—indeed, must be; but the great movement of humankind is steadily along the right line.

I know we have some doleful philosophers still; we must have them for a while; they make life interesting for us optimists. My optimism is not simply that of the man who fell from the tenth story of a building, and as he passed each window cried out, "All right so far!" It is rather that of the frog who with his companion fell into a churn half filled with cream. One frog was a pessimist. He said: "This is a miserable mess, and we shall never get out," and he sank. The other, who was an optimist, said: "This is a bad mess, but I shall kick, and keep on kicking." He did, and he was found sitting on a pat of butter in the morning. The very constitution of things is on the side of the optimist, if he will only see it and keep kicking for the right.

THE CHAIRMAN: A part of the power of this Conference is in the composition of its membership. We have women as members of the Conference. I anticipate that before we get through we shall hear from some of the ladies, but in lieu of that, at present we are going to hear from one who instructs the young ladies at one of our first female institutions, Professor J. C. Bracq, of Vassar College, a Frenchman by birth.

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR J. C. BRACQ.

A STRONGER SENSE OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE NEEDED.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: My plea is for the development of a stronger sense of international justice in our meetings. I have always been delighted, at this Conference, by the broad surveys of the movement of peace and arbitration in Europe which have been presented to us by Dr. Trueblood. In the utterances of other speakers I have often been struck by their unconscious injustice to the rest of the world. Even Dr. Trueblood, always so fair, referred to the connection of a distinguished American with the Institute of International Law, but he did not tell us that its founder was a representative of the so-called "decaying Latin nations," a professor from the University of Turin. He spoke of the Interparliamentary Union, but he did not say that it was inspired and founded by my countryman, Passy. I regret this, because it tends to narrow the scope and to belittle the great movement of peace and arbitration in the civilized world.

Dr. Gumplowicz, professor of sociology at the University of Gratz, says that there are illusions which have been most baneful in the wider life of the world. He mentions two of them which, with real German facility for coining new names, he calls "acrochronism" and "ethnocentrism." Acrochronism is the illusion which leads us to think that what we are doing is the culminating point of some great process. I notice that among us there have been traces not a few of this illusion. Some have spoken of the establishment of a court at The Hague as if we had reached there some kind of finality, while it is essentially a part of a great movement, centuries old,—a movement the extension of which my fatherland attempted, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in Canada, where Frenchmen tried to establish a confederation of peace among the Indians, to prevent them from destroying each other. For me the Conference of The Hague is only one important stage in a great movement which is to grow with great rapidity, to widen its scope, to accomplish things which will be as much greater than the Peace Conference at The Hague as that Conference was an advance over the Geneva Convention of 1864, and this convention over the Congress of Peace in Paris in 1849. This congress was only the expression of generous hopes voiced by its president, Victor Hugo, who said: "The day is coming when the fate of nations will no longer be decided by cannon balls and by bullets, but by a supreme senate of Europe, which shall judge of right and wrong, and decide upon the questions which bring nations into conflict."

The second illusion mentioned by Dr. Gumplowicz, ethnocentrism, is the idea that our own nation is the centre of civilization. I found this in Paris, in Belgium, among Germans. I have met Englishmen, and many, who were not over modest in this respect, and Americans speaking in the same strain. At the Paris Exposition I spent much time in looking up one point of great interest; namely, the geographical distribution of what we call civilization. I found that civilization is not geographically co-extensive with France, nor with Germany, nor with England or America, but with the territories whose representatives did the best service at The Hague. We recognize that the English-speaking peoples have done nobly for civilization, and thereby for arbitration and peace, but other nations have been at least as useful.

We must get rid of a certain nationalistic pride and an unconscious particularism which are mischievous. At the Paris Exposition I visited the exhibits of peace societies. The lady in charge said to me in substance: "We women sent a petition to The Hague, and if the Conference was a success it was our work." I did not have the courage to dispel her illusions. I heard Mr. Holls speak of the Hague Conference at Vassar, and here at Mohonk, and I have read his book. According to that gentleman, when the American delegation went to The Hague they found the atmosphere filled with cynicism and pessimism. This characterization of the delegates is everything but generous. It seems to me that in view of the

stupendous work before them a certain amount of discouragement was in the nature of things. Mr. Holls tells us how the American delegation came in "like a refreshing breeze" and brought the Conference to a happy issue. To this I would simply answer that when twenty-six powers sign an agreement like that of The Hague it is because they wish so to do. Many of them did so because they were compelled by the national conscience. What impresses me among several of these nations is the growth of feelings of peace and humanity which have been so well voiced by my friend, Dr. Moxom. I would add one note which he has not given. I think that there is growing in Europe something vastly better than sympathy — a new sense of international justice. We cannot bring all the nations together for international peace unless we impress upon them the fact that we desire to be just with them.

Though a Frenchman, I am no great enthusiast over Russia, but I see in that country something besides soldiers and Cossacks or the great Autocrat with his alleged sinister designs of territorial aggression. I see earnest men and women whose hearts and souls are burning with the desire to put an end to this nameless thing we call war. I see a man like Novicow in sociology, Tolstoy in literature, Verestchagin in art, and other personalities of distinction, who have shown their hatred of war. In Germany, Austria and Italy our cause has found noble advocates. In Switzerland the attitude of the people toward arbitration is all that could be wished. The knowledge of the arbitration question is more widely distributed in that country than in any other country of the world. Belgium has done nobly for the work of peace. M. Beernaert and Chevalier Descamps are among the most distinguished leaders of the cause of arbitration in Europe.

As to France, there is a great deal which is gratifying. First of all, the establishment of a court of arbitration at The Hague gave general satisfaction. The government showed great diligence and wisdom in appointing the French judges. The Exposition, two years ago, was a great object lesson of peace. Never have more men from more countries gathered together at one point for a peaceful purpose. Never have more powers gathered with an altruistic spirit, each trying to make the other benefit from the experience of all. The Exposition revealed to many men that they have more to gain from the arts of peace than from the interests of war. The discussions which followed in the press as the result of the comparative study of implements of war was on the whole optimistic. The conclusions of M. Hanotaux, our former Minister of Foreign Affairs, were that war, by the force of industrial and social progress, is bound to recede further and further from us in time and in place.

Since then many have been the manifestations of the national spirit in this respect. President Kruger visited us; he had a warm reception in Marseilles and in Paris. The great voice of the masses when he appeared was not, "Down with England," but *Vive l'arbitrage!* The people who had heard of the Court at The Hague, who

had heard of a tribunal of international justice, were enthusiastic, and *Vive l'arbitrage* voiced their deepest feelings, and *Vive l'arbitrage* has become, in more ways than one, the watchword of the Socialists. The Socialists of France to a man are on the side of arbitration, on the side of peace, and positively against international wars.

The award of the Nobel prize also helped our cause. You know that it was divided into two parts, which were given to two men of the French-speaking world. One-half was given to Dunant, a man who devoted all his energies and fortune to bring about the Convention of Geneva in 1864. The romantic, not to say heroic, story of his labors was in most of the newspapers, exciting interest in the work so dear to Dunant. The other half of this prize was bestowed upon my countryman, M. Passy. That was the occasion for a great deal of talk about arbitration and peace. Even the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences made a significant demonstration on this occasion. Passy and Dunant, long considered dreamers, are among the most revered men wherever they are known, and with increasing respect for the men has come increased respect for their principles. One fact of great importance in this direction is that in many of the text-books of morals used in the common schools the principles of arbitration are taught. From this we may expect great results in the future.

As a people we have not only made progress along the line of ideas and principles, but also along that of practice. At the close of the Paris Exposition there was a prospect of a great number of litigations between the authorities and some of the exhibitors. A board of arbitration was appointed and all cases were settled. One of the greatest strikes France ever had was settled by the arbitration of M. Waldeck-Rousseau. One member of his cabinet openly advocated compulsory arbitration in labor troubles. The arbitration idea is working its way into French life. The settlement of the Franco-Brazilian controversy by arbitration was important. It was a strong test of national consistency in this matter. You all remember the criticisms which were made of the award upon the arbitration of the Delagoa Bay difficulty, and the protests which it called forth. I feared lest the Franco-Brazilian award should have a worse fate. It was disappointing in the highest degree for Frenchmen. It gave us only one-fiftieth part of our first claim and one-thirty-third part of our last claim. The press of the country accepted the verdict good-naturedly, and said in substance: "We thought we were right; we have committed this case to men of strict impartiality and of judicial ability; they have given their award, and now it is for us to accept it pleasantly." It was so accepted.

As I look at France I feel as optimistic as Dr. Trueblood when he makes his survey of Europe. I think that the principles of arbitration are not only rapidly entering into the organized life of the nation, but that the forces which help these principles are growing stronger and stronger. As I look over the wider field of the

Continent, I am impressed with the fact that the powers are bound together by more ties than ever before. Any attempt to erect Chinese walls has failed by the very force of things. The nations of Europe are growing to be a great organism. They recognize that you cannot weaken or wrong part of an organism without weakening and wronging the whole. Obviously there is an increasing sense of solidarity which will tell mightily on the side of peace.

Concluding, I would say that the great thing for us to do is to spread and foster ideas of international justice. We must set the people to think right upon this matter, and then to make them feel right, and then to make them will right. I am sure that if they think right, feel right and will right, they will do right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I feel that I ought to make some amends for possible inaptness in my introduction of the last speaker, by recognizing the great service he has rendered this Conference in the hint which he has given us, for our profit, of our national spirit of egotism. We have been properly reminded that all the good of the world is not centered in the United States, and that there are other nations that are doing a good deal towards promoting the cause of arbitration.

Now, I want to mention something that he refrained from stating, and that is a fact of history that we all remember: If the dagger of an assassin had not brought to an untimely death Henry of Navarre, the King of France more than two centuries ago, who advocated a universal combination of the Christian nations of Europe for the promotion of peace, arbitration might have been much farther advanced to-day than it is. If Henry of Navarre were living now, I have no doubt we should find him abreast, if not in advance, of the movements of the Mohonk Conference.

The subject was then declared open for general discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are two thoughts in my mind suggested by Dr. Trueblood's remarks. The Pan-American Congress, as he stated, unanimously agreed upon the submission to the Hague tribunal of all questions of claims. That agreement is in the form of a treaty which has to be ratified by the Senate of the United States. This treaty has not yet been ratified, and I think we may well use our influence in trying to secure its early approval by the Senate.

My other thought is about the Hague tribunal. It is a great tribunal, and it has not had to wait so long as the Supreme Court of the United States to have a case before it; but it may have to wait a long time before it has a great case referred to it, unless the sentiment of the world crystallizes around it. A half century ago the great powers of the world came together in the Paris Conference, and agreed then, just after the Crimean War, that they would settle all their subsequent questions by mediation and not by war; and yet since that time they have not settled one question by mediation, but nearly every one of them has been at war with some other. No

nation is compelled to go to the Hague Court with an important question, and probably no nation will go to it with such a question unless the public sentiment of the country requires the government to do so.

Secretary Hay was anxious that the nations who had gathered in Peking, and were about to exact from China that enormous indemnity, should submit their claims to the Hague Court; but not a single one of them except our government was willing to do this. This shows that we have got to educate the sentiment of the people in order to get important questions before that tribunal.

MR. C. H. BUTLER: In view of the remarks just made, I move that a committee, of which the Chair shall be a member, draft a proper resolution on the subject to present to the Senate of the United States as the feeling of this Conference.

THE CHAIRMAN: That motion will be referred to the Business Committee.

MR. CHARLES RICHARDSON: I should like to make another suggestion for consideration by the Business Committee, and that is, that a short statement be prepared by direction of that Committee under two heads: one, Why business men should promote international arbitration; and the other, How business men can promote international arbitration. I think such a statement could be put in the form of a small leaflet, very condensed and clear, because it is only in such form, as a rule, that you can get business men to read anything of that kind. Then if those leaflets could be sent to business organizations throughout all our cities, with the request that the governing body of each organization should recommend it to the careful consideration of their members, and have it sent to each member, I think it might do a great deal in the direction of educational work.

MR. C. R. WOODRUFF, Secretary, said that the matter mentioned by the last speaker was to be the subject of one of the sessions, and that out of that might grow something that would make Mr. Richardson's suggestions possible of fulfilment.

MR. JOHN B. GARRETT spoke of the inspiring opening which the Conference had had, which he did not think could be improved by further additions, and therefore moved an adjournment till the evening session.

MR. A. K. SMILEY: It is our custom at all our Conferences held here to try to mingle pleasure with business; so we do not have any session in the afternoon. The afternoon is devoted to social intercourse and chiefly to riding. We have carriages provided for all the invited guests, and they can take whichever of the numerous drives about the premises they please. We want all of you to enjoy yourselves.

The meeting then adjourned.

Second Session.

Wednesday Evening, May 28, 1902.

THE Conference was called to order by the President at 8 o'clock.

MR. ALEXANDER C. WOOD, the Treasurer, after reading his report, said that in view of the expenditures which were likely to be necessary for printing and distributing the Report of the proceedings, it would be wise for the Conference to raise at least \$1,200. He would be ready as treasurer to take contributions at the close of the session, and on all occasions till the Conference closed.

The Treasurer's report was then accepted, and ordered placed on file.

MR. C. R. WOODRUFF, Secretary, explained that of the 10,000 copies of the Annual Report distributed the past year, 2,282 were sent to libraries and 5,363 to individuals. He hoped that the Conference would be ready, as in previous years, to provide the Finance Committee with funds to give the same publicity to the proceedings as usual.

The Chairman announced as the topic for the evening: "Forces Making for International Arbitration," and called on President Augustus H. Strong of the Rochester Theological Seminary as the first speaker.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT STRONG.

THE ELEMENT OF JUSTICE IN WAR.

I stand as a novice before this distinguished company, and I would fain speak some words that would go to the heart of the matter. I want to set before you some fundamental principle which may influence our consideration of the whole subject, and the one word of all words that I would impress upon your minds, as it is impressed upon my mind, is the word "Justice."

Grant me your indulgence for a few moments while I speak to you of "The Element of Justice in War."

"Revenge," says Lord Bacon, "is a wild sort of justice." War also is a wild sort of justice, and, unless we recognize the element of justice in it, we shall never be able to tame its wildness. It is my belief that an insufficient appreciation of this feature of war has done much to delay the advent of peace. We can purchase peace at too

great a price. The only peace worth having, the only peace that has promise of permanence, is peace upon the basis of justice. International arbitration is desirable only so far as it will ensure international justice.

The two great foci of the moral ellipse are rights and duties, righteousness and love, self-affirmation and self-impartation. In the nature of things justice must precede altruism; the sense of one's own rights must precede the sense of others' rights; duty to one's self must precede duty to others. Self-defense is the condition of all benevolence, for unless I maintain my own existence I shall have nothing that I can give away. Self-love is just as important as the feeling of community. Both are recognized in Christ's system, for I am bound to love my neighbor only as myself.

In the age-long evolutionary process, by which a divine hand has prepared the way for human history, I find both these principles at work. I find the beginnings of altruism in the instinct of reproduction and in the care for offspring. In every lion's den and tiger's lair, in every mother-eagle's feeding of her young, there is a self-sacrifice which faintly shadows forth man's subordination of personal interests to the interests of others. But in the ages before man I find incipient justice as well as incipient love. The struggle for one's own life has its moral side, as well as the struggle for the life of others. The instinct of self-preservation is the beginning of right, righteousness, justice and law on earth. Self-defense is a duty, because all life is a trust. Every creature owes it to God to preserve his own being. So I find an adumbration of morality even in the predatory and internecine warfare of palæontologic ages. The immanent God was even then preparing the way for the rights, the dignity, the freedom, of humanity.

The right to one's own being and the duty of preserving it involve the right to property, the means of sustaining self, and the right to family, the means of perpetuating self. The right to property and to family is a corollary of the right to life. When others attack property or family, it is my duty to defend, for it is an attack upon my right to live. And as the family, the tribe, the state, is but the enlarged individual, or the aggregate of individuals, the same duty of self-defense rests upon them. So long as there are attempted violations of individual or social rights, there must be laws, police, prisons, — in other words, the means of forcibly suppressing wrong-doing.

Count Tolstoy regards all this as a perversion of morality and a contradiction of the commands of Christ. He would interpret with absolute literalness the injunction to give to him that asketh thee, to resist not evil, to turn the other cheek to the smiter. In public places he is followed by a crowd of beggars to whom he distributes coin, and his principles would certainly forbid resistance to the burglar and the assassin. In view of the utterances of the Apostle Paul with regard to the powers that be, and to their bearing not the sword in vain, we must interpret our Saviour's words as a vivid declaration

that all personal and selfish withholding is wrong, but that withholding and resistance for God's sake and for the sake of the larger interests of society is right. We are to please our neighbor only for his real good, and unto edification. To give to the tramp is not really to give at all, in the Saviour's sense, for it is doing him a harm instead of a benefit. The world would soon be a desert, if that principle were generally acted upon. Marauders and thugs would soon outnumber the industrious and law-abiding population. God's interests and the interests of humanity require that Hampden should refuse to pay the ship-money, and all heroes of defensive war may also be Christian heroes.

William Ellery Channing uttered only a half-truth when he traced all war back to the fact of human sin. There would be no war if sin had its way. Selfishness would simply swallow up the earth. It is opposition that makes war. The sense of justice that stands for its rights is just as important an element in war as is the original aggression. And even this aggression not only puts on the semblance of justice,—it has in it a grain of justice. It is the effort of the strong to hold its own. It asserts the right of the fittest to survive. It is largely the result of ignorance, of unfounded fears, of bad policy. The wars that are begun out of sheer ambition or malignity are few and far between.

There are people who believe that all litigation is selfish, and that all lawyers are the instruments of knaves or are themselves knaves. Larger knowledge of the world shows us that such cases are very rare; most litigation is an attempt to settle honest differences of opinion; most lawyers have some feeling that they are officers of the law and helpers to the courts in the administration of justice. Lawyers and courts are imperfect methods of adjudication; but, if there were no sense of justice and no effort to do justice, their occupation would be gone.

Let not the imperfect administration of justice blind us to the fact that in most controversies justice is the main thing sought. Moses has been blamed for demanding an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. It was but the provision of the best justice that age could understand. There are phases of society where the duel is the only way of settling disputes—to be praised simply because it is better than nothing. And even lynch-law is better than no law at all, as was made clear in the early history of California. Hideous as it is in its practical working, it witnesses to the existence of a moral sense, and it can never be done away until men are convinced that, instead of the law's delays and the purchase of pardons, swift justice can be done by regular methods upon wrong-doing.

In a similar manner, war is not all butchery and murder. In the majority of cases, war is a mistaken and barbaric attempt to secure justice. War is duel and lynch-law on an enormous scale. And war is to be abolished just as we have abolished duel and lynch-law at the North. There are some parts of this country where men still

go about like walking batteries, with dirks and pistols and blunderbusses projecting like the guns from a man-of-war. One citizen goes heavily armed, and another puts on heavier armor to meet him. How ineffably absurd these would-be combatants have come to seem! Yet the nations that lead the van of civilization, the Christian nations,—heaven save the mark!—still strut under the open sky, armed to the teeth, and silently dare one another to knock the chip from the shoulder. How shall we abolish this gigantic anachronism and absurdity? Just as we abolished lynch-law and the duel,—by providing justice in a trustworthy and regular way.

It is sometimes said that education will do away with war. It certainly teaches that a nation is not the best judge in its own case, any more than an individual man is the best judge in his own cause. But education has not abolished affairs of honor in Germany, where education is most nearly universal, nor will education abolish conflicts among the nations. It is sometimes said that trade and commerce will abolish war. They certainly draw nations together and make them feel their mutual dependence. I learned the other day that the larger part of the product of a great harvester-manufactory in Western New York goes to Siberia. But helping Russia to develop her vast territory is also helping her to threaten China and all Western Europe as well. Trade and commerce profit in some ways by the favor and inflation of war, as was shown by our own experience during the great Rebellion, and British commercial enterprise undoubtedly did something to bring on the war in South Africa.

It is said, finally, that war is a moral evil and can be stopped only by moral means. This moral means is thought to be a new sense of community, a new feeling that mankind is of one blood, and that no portion of humanity can suffer without every other portion suffering with it. True enough, and inadequate as it is true. Still the question returns, how to apply the principle. Love can never condone iniquity. Even the sense of community, the love for man as man, will not put an end to war, unless the conscience is satisfied, and man's greatest moral need is met. That need is the need of justice. Goodwill alone cannot ensure peace. Peace is possible only upon the basis of right. The men who once appealed to the bowie knife or the revolver to settle important questions of right now submit their case to courts of law; but if they did not believe they would get justice there, they would fight it out in the old way. And so, when nations differ as to important questions of right, they will give up war only as some court is provided where justice will be swift and sure.

The ideal international court is unquestionably a court where reference is compulsory and where decisions are final. Humanity demands such a court, and it has the right to establish one. What right have I to stop a fight between two brutal men? The right of common humanity. Rights of humanity are above rights of individuality; they are above rights of nationality also. Massacre,

atrocities, oppression, on the part of any nation, are beginning to be recognized as warranting other nations to interfere. And the day will come when war will be regarded by the community of nations as warranting interference in the conflict, and the binding over of both belligerents to keep the peace. The nation that stands in the way of the world's progress must be set aside, not by war, as the Boers have been set aside by Britain, but by the judgment of a court sitting in the interest of the world's civilization.

Compulsory arbitration is yet an ideal, a distant goal, at present unattainable. It presupposes a federation of the world and a partial relinquishment of sovereignty by the individual states. International law and treaties between nations are steps toward it. International law, to be sure, is not law at all, because there is no power to enforce. But it may be almost as effective as law. There is a growing public opinion, which civilized nations are loath to contradict. It has been well said that "fine and imprisonment do not deter decent people from violations of law half so much as do social penalties of ostracism and disgrace;" and it is coming to be so among the nations.

I rejoice in the great new forward movement of three years ago. The actual establishment of a tribunal for even voluntary appeal is a moral victory whose importance cannot be measured. It shows that in spite of armies and wars the conscience of the world is on the right side. And it offers a safe and practicable means of securing the ostensible end for which war is waged; namely, the establishment of justice. An international tribunal may not, in the near future, be able to enforce its decisions. Judgments without ships and armies may indeed be law without penalty. But exclusion from civilized society is a sort of penalty. The decisions of such a tribunal will have the same sanctions as a treaty, and treaties have proved themselves, not impotent, but mighty.

And yet the chief value of occasional and voluntary arbitration is that it opens the way for arbitration that is compulsory and universal. It is very significant that the word *Recht*, which in German means "right," has come also to mean "law." *Das deutsche Recht* is "German law." And the Latin word *Jus* has suffered a similar extension of meaning. Etymology teaches us many lessons, but no lesson is more impressive than this, that what was once merely subjective and ideal has come gradually to express itself in objective and external enactment. I see in all this the influence of the omnipresent Christ. He is moralizing the world, making keen its conscience, revealing to man his own better nature, putting truth and righteousness more and more into statutory form. His ways are ways of gradual development, and they are ways of justice as well as of love. First pure, then peaceable. At the first he brings, not peace, but a sword, because that is the only practicable justice. But later, when the world is ready, and his spirit of love has taught men to see their essential oneness in him, he will turn all outward law into inward law, and there will be universal peace because there is

universal justice, under the sovereign sway of him who is Prince of Peace, because he is also King of Righteousness.

My hope of peace is bound up with my hope of justice. I do not expect love alone ever to abolish war. I regard war as a necessary evil so long as better means of adjudication are lacking. War is a stern and savage tribunal, but it has settled many a dispute. It will give way only to a tribunal in which justice is more rapid and unerring. Let goodwill, then, bend its energies, not to vain outcry against war, but to the perfecting of its substitute. Arbitration is our hope, because arbitration secures the justice of war without its wildness. Because arbitration promises this, I can say with the poet :

“ Down the dark future, through long generations,
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease ;
And like a bell, with solemn, sweet vibrations,
I hear once more the voice of Christ say, ‘ Peace ! ’

“ Peace ! and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of War’s great organ shakes the skies !
But, beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise.”

Miss M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr College, was next introduced, and spoke on the relation of educated women to the movement for international arbitration and peace.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT M. CAREY THOMAS.

INFLUENCE OF EDUCATED WOMEN FOR ARBITRATION AND PEACE.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen : I left Boston at midnight last night, and when I reached Mohonk Lake at two o’clock this afternoon I was told by our host, Mr. Smiley, and Mr. C. R. Woodruff, Secretary of the Conference, that the Business Committee had announced an address by me on to-night’s programme. Of course, in this place Mr. Smiley’s word is law, and we in Philadelphia have also formed a wholesome habit of obeying Mr. Woodruff when he leads the forlorn hope of state and civic reform in Pennsylvania.

There is, however, another reason for my consenting to speak at such short notice. There are few causes I have more at heart than that of international arbitration. I sometimes think that the strength of my conviction of the good that will follow from the general acceptance of the principle of international arbitration is only second to my belief in the beneficent revolution to be wrought in human affairs by the results of the higher education of women.

The especial aspect of the subject of international arbitration that I am to treat has also been selected for me by the Business Committee, and I must ask you to hold them, and not me, responsible for the very inadequate way in which I shall deal with it.

I am asked to tell you whether in my opinion the higher education

of women will be one of the forces of the twentieth century making for international arbitration and peace. One of the preceding speakers has urged upon women as a sex the necessity of redoubling their efforts to influence their husbands and sons in favor of peace, but I am not at all sure that in the twentieth century their influence will be exerted only indirectly through whatever power they may possess to change the opinions of the men in their families, although this mutual influence of the sexes will always be important.

The twentieth century will certainly see a wider direct influence of women in public affairs. There are a good many reasons for looking forward to this: the strongest perhaps is the one emphasized by the Hon. Carroll D. Wright the other day in a very remarkable article, in which he claims that the wider influence of women in affairs will be brought about by the fact that they are now being compelled to enter the industrial world as active workers. No one can doubt this fact. We see evidences of it on all sides. A great many women dislike it, and would rather continue to be supported by their fathers and husbands and brothers and cousins and uncles in the future, as they have been in the past; but industrial conditions are such that the men of their own families can no longer make enough to support them in comfort, and they are being compelled to maintain themselves. This change in the ordinary life of women is evident even among our students at Bryn Mawr College. I am apt to know what the students are looking forward to in life, as they often talk over their future with me, and I suppose that about a third of them are being sent to college by their parents in order that they may afterwards support themselves. I have reason to believe that the proportion of self-supporting women is comparatively small at Bryn Mawr, and that in many of the colleges for women fully two-thirds of the students intend to support themselves after they have finished their college course. The magnitude of the change in public opinion is apparent when we remember that the girls in college to-day, at least in the East, are the daughters of professional men and of business men of the well-to-do classes, who twenty-five years ago would have thought it a social disgrace for the women of their families to be financially independent, at least during their lifetimes.

Mr. Wright seems to me correct in his assumption that self-supporting women will necessarily interest themselves much more actively in national and civic matters than has been the habit of women in general in the past, and with interest will come a wider knowledge of affairs and a deeper feeling of responsibility for the conduct of the state.

There are many subjects, indeed most subjects, on which educated men and women will always think alike, but there are certain others—and peace is, I think, one of these—to the solution of which we may perhaps as a sex contribute a fresh point of view and new convictions. I often think that for those of us who are

engaged in educating women there is a certain delightful excitement. We all know what educated men will accomplish, and more educated men, desirable as education is, will only accomplish a little more of the same thing that educated men have achieved in the past; but we do not at all know—even those of us most closely associated with the movement are wholly unable to predict—what wonderful changes may be brought about in the future when we have had an opportunity to impress large numbers of educated women with the importance of thoughtful consideration of the social problems that affect us so intimately.

International arbitration is, I think, one of the movements in which we may look for rapid progress when women begin to take a deeper interest in national and international affairs. There are many reasons for thinking this, but I will mention only the three most important: First, women suffer far more from the consequences of war than men. I feel very sure that if men had to stay at home and watch and pray while their wives and daughters fought, they would not be as willing to go to war as they are now. Those of us who remember hearing Southern women tell of their agony of helplessness waiting for news that was always bad news, while their fathers and brothers and lovers were away from them fighting,—and of course it was just as hard for women in the North,—must realize that in war women have much the harder role. Second, war destroys a great deal that women as a sex care most for. I have sometimes wondered whether the happy position of American women, the honor in which they are held by American men and the deference shown them, which is really peculiar to America and impresses every foreigner who comes to this country, is not due to the fact that in the past we have not had standing armies, so that our sons and brothers and lovers have not been separated from home life at the most formative period of their lives and compelled to live together in military barracks, where circumstances seem to make it almost unavoidable for them to lead a life that forever afterwards lowers their respect for women. After living four years in Germany and France I reached the conclusion that much in the attitude of Germans and Frenchmen toward women, which is so immeasurably different from the attitude of American men toward American women, may be explained by military conscription and all its disastrous consequences for the home life of a nation. Third, women in the past have led lives at home, carefully guarded from a great deal that is unpleasant,—and this will always be the case for a large number of women in the future,—and they are therefore more sensitive than men to the unrighteousness of war, so that when women come to exercise a direct influence on affairs they will, I believe, exercise an influence on the side of arbitration that will prove to be well nigh irresistible.

As I said a few months ago at the Peace Conference held in Philadelphia, I do not think that the subject of international

arbitration is properly presented to the college students in different parts of the country. Whenever I address the Bryn Mawr College students on the subject I find myself out of sympathy with my audience. As an illustration, only a few weeks ago in one of my talks in the chapel I recommended the students to read a very striking article by Mark Twain against war. I asked some of them afterwards what they thought of it. They replied that it seemed to them the most unpatriotic and un-American thing they had ever read! The young people of to-day seem to think that international arbitration is in some mysterious way a treasonable and unpatriotic doctrine. This Conference could do nothing better than send speakers on this subject to our colleges and universities.

The last speaker referred to the different state of education on questions of war and peace to be observed in various parts of our country, and an incident that occurred in a Shakespeare class at Bryn Mawr College the other day is a good illustration of this. The professor asked the students what seemed to them particularly human and natural in Shakespeare's play of Romeo and Juliet. A little freshman from Kentucky answered that the most natural thing in the play seemed to her to be the street brawls between the Capulets and the Montagues, and was completely amazed by the shout of laughter from the class that greeted her remark. She could not see that she had said anything at all amusing; street brawls and family feuds were to her the natural way of living.

Burke, as quoted by Matthew Arnold in a passage in which he seems to have mistaken Burke's meaning,—although it is historically true in the sense in which Matthew Arnold understands it,—says that when a great revolution is to take place in thought and practice everything prepares itself for the change, that all tides sweep in this direction, and that finally there is no one left to oppose the movement. In the twentieth century we ought to see the universal acceptance and practice of international arbitration. Perhaps there may be a backward ebb of the wave at present; indeed, it seems as if there were not the same strong sentiment in favor of peace that there was two or three years ago. But certainly by the end of the century, and I hope long before, we shall see this great revolution in thought and practice; and in bringing about this revolution women as a sex will, I believe, play a very important part.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would not attempt to emphasize anything Miss Thomas has said, but I want to add to it a bit of personal experience. When I went into the army during the Civil War I left at home a young wife with her first-born babe in her arms, and I had the best part of it. Many people in this audience will respond to my experience. I had the excitement of the camp, and the march, and the triumph when we attained it; but the anxious wife at home — her suffering was much greater than mine! And it is so in all wars; the women are the ones who suffer most, and the women are those who should be most deeply interested in promoting this cause of arbitration.

When I announce the next speaker you will probably come to the conclusion that we are having an educational séance to-night. I do not know why we should not, for we are engaged in an educational movement. Partly, I suppose, for that reason the Committee has asked the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York, Hon. Charles R. Skinner, to be the next speaker.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES R. SKINNER.

THE FORCE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

Mr. President, Friends of Arbitration: It was delightful to hear Secretary Foster tell what has been accomplished in the way of international arbitration during one short year, and to hear Dr. Trueblood tell us of the great work along this line accomplished during the past ten years. I enjoyed the first meeting of this Conference seven years ago, and I have watched quite carefully the progress of arbitration since that first meeting. In the light of what was told us at the morning meeting, when we are considering to-night the forces making for international arbitration, it surely is not asking too much to have you give credit to the Mohonk Conference as one of the greatest forces toward that end during the last decade.

If you have studied this movement during the past few years you cannot fail to have noticed that the words which have been spoken in this Conference have gone out through the world influencing men, and, as I believe, influencing governments, to pay closer attention to those movements which have for their object the doing away with war. The forces making for international arbitration are the same forces which make for civilization, for good government, for enlightened citizenship and for national prosperity.

The mighty force lying behind this movement, it seems to me, is education. Public education is doing its great work in the enlightenment of the world upon this subject. It is giving a deeper comprehension of what fellowship means. The importance of teaching in our schools and in our homes the mighty force of unselfishness is not yet, however, realized as it ought to be. Generations ago the church and the school taught against selfishness; it seems to me that that instruction could still be continued with profit, because selfishness in person or in state is a great cause of conflict.

Obedience to law, whether in the home, in the school or in the state, should receive the closest attention of every man and woman engaged in the educational work of the world. Obedience is the true foundation of government, whether local or state, whether home or school. Our children should be taught that the will of the parent is their law to be implicitly obeyed. And when the children are sent to the schools they should be taught that the will of the teacher is then to be their law. If in the home and the school this education is rightly given, then when these children go out into the state they will know what it is to be good law-abiding, unselfish citizens.

Underlying the struggles and conflicts of the world's activities there is the sentiment constantly going out of love for our fellow-men. We cannot deny that underneath all these activities there is a feeling of sympathy, of tolerance, of charity; and upon these foundations good government is built. Especially is this true of the English-speaking people. We are astonished at the progress of international arbitration during the past few years; but this has been the certain result of the education of public opinion. Education gives a broader comprehension of civic duty and public responsibility.

It was only a short time ago that the whole world was interested in the life of one little child, the child of the President, who lay sick at school. He was not too small to excite the interest of all the people. One of the most touching incidents that ever came to my attention in public life was when in the House of Representatives a message was read at the desk, coming from the Queen of England, addressed to the President of the United States, offering the ship "Alert" fully equipped with men and provisions to go in search of the lost Arctic explorers. I believe it was the only time that I ever saw tears rolling down the cheeks of a member of Congress. Not many months ago the whole world mourned the death of one of the greatest Queens that ever ruled a kingdom. Soon after that the whole world mourned again at the death of one of the richest products of American institutions, our beloved President, William McKinley. We all remember — and our memory is touched at the thought — this government's generosity when the people of Russia were starving and our Western grain fields were granaries which we placed at the disposal of that friendly nation.

It is not very long since two great nations contended between themselves as to which had been the most friendly toward the United States. As Chauncy Depew said, "Years ago the Cabinet at Washington and the United States government were hardly mentioned in foreign courts, and now they talk of little else." That was just preceding the visit of Prince Henry, and the American people vied with each other to show their respect for a sensible prince representing a great foreign nation. Within the past month, when a beautiful white city was wiped off the face of the earth, and thousands of people were starving, it was the American government that first passed a resolution through its Congress appropriating money for relief, and it was an American war vessel that carried the first supplies to the island representing the French Republic. I saw only yesterday that an American war vessel had been placed at the disposal of the English government to transport the remains of Lord Paunceforte to Great Britain. It seems to me that all these deeds of kindness assure us that there is a friendly spirit in the air among all nations.

We cannot, therefore, help being optimists. But public education must further enlarge and develop this spirit of friendship. The public schools must do their part in giving strength to those ideas

and sentiments which work out the conditions of peace. The thought must not be allowed that our public schools are to make soldiers; our public schools must make *citizens*. I take no part in that movement which would place military instruction in the public schools. I never could see how good could result from giving our children tin soldiers as playthings.

One more point. Dr. Trueblood has told us that within the past century there have been two hundred cases of disputes between nations settled by arbitration. That is a revelation to most of us. It would be a revelation to the pupils in our schools to-day. How much have our histories in our schools told of what international arbitration has accomplished? Is it not a good time to begin to present those things to our boys and girls? Our histories tell us how many men were killed at Gettysburg: let our histories tell us what resulted from the battle of Gettysburg, and leave those soldiers in the glorious graves they found.

Our women must in large part do this educating. The women are in force in the public schools. Five-sixths of all our teachers are women. We must expect them to make our citizens. They teach our history; and as for me I would prefer that they should tell what has been accomplished through arbitration to secure the peace of the world than how many soldiers marched up and down with Cæsar. I believe in teaching those things which go to make our government of to-day—why it was organized and how it is managed—rather than going back two thousand years to a country that is dead and gone.

The Chairman then introduced Mr. James McKeen of the city of New York.

ADDRESS OF MR. JAMES McKEEN.

DIFFICULTIES TO BE OVERCOME.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Conference: There are two kinds of advocates: one kind of advocate looks only at his own side of the case, and deliberately blinds his eyes to the other side. That kind of advocate generally excels "in saucy and audacious eloquence." There is another kind who is more apt to think primarily: What is my opponent going to say in this case? What are the facts that *he* can present to this jury? Now, I know that the rule of your Business Committee prevents discussion of any but one side of the question of arbitration. Far be it from me to violate so salutary a rule; but possibly you will pardon the habit of the advocate if, before coming to an enumeration of some of the forces which it seems to me are truly impelling the cause of international arbitration forward, we look at some of the forces which are to be met and overcome in the progress of the cause; some of those things which make many wise men skeptical about the ultimate success of arbitration as a method of settlement of international disputes.

In my opinion, the great test of the Hague tribunal is to come when some powerful nation, after submitting its case to this tribunal, shall repudiate its judgment. What are you going to do about it then? I do not know but some members of this Conference will feel like shouldering a musket and enforcing by war what they will consider to have been a just judgment repudiated by an unjust nation. Possibly it may be true that the scorn of the rest of the civilized world will be a sufficient sanction for the enforcement of the judgments of the international court of arbitration; but it is the apprehension that arbitration cannot succeed without force behind it that makes so many men doubtful about its ultimate success.

You often hear the settlement of controversies between man and man in the courts referred to as instances of the peaceful settlement of disputes; but the man who has his property or his person taken under a writ of execution does not look upon that as a peaceful settlement. He looks upon it as something very much like war. And we all have to admit that the reason why most of the judgments of our courts are observed and carried out peaceably is because the citizens against whom those judgments are rendered know that behind the judgment is the execution, and behind the execution is the sheriff, and behind the sheriff is the posse, and, if the sheriff and the posse are not sufficient to enforce that judgment, behind them all stands the National Guard of the State.

This kind of reasoning is one of the forces that are against us in this matter: the apprehension that arbitration unaccompanied with force will be nothing but an endless chain of weakness. Because everybody must admit that if a nation which has submitted a controversy to a tribunal repudiates that judgment and refuses to carry it out, there is thus a difference immediately arisen which cannot be again submitted to arbitration, for if you go on submitting and submitting with no result you have an endless chain which lands you in a slough of imbecility.

Another thing that I think has bred skepticism about the success of arbitration is the feeling, induced by a philosophic study of history, that generally years of peace in the world have only come about as the result of practically universal empire. Dr. Hale has said that the greatest and longest era of peace which the civilized world has ever known was that which attended and followed the age of the Antonines. Why was this? Because that was an age when one power had practically dominated the civilized world. So to-day many people feel that we never again can see an era of lasting peace until some one power dominates again the civilized world.

But in spite of tendencies toward great consolidations, there is this remarkable fact in our time, — and now I am coming to what seems to me the answer to all these grounds of skepticism, — there is palpably a growing enthusiasm for race sovereignty in the world. Instead of a tendency towards universal empire, in Europe we observe an intensification of the spirit of nationality. We have seen in our time the Austrian Empire shaken to its foundations by the

intensity of the demand for sovereign dominion by the Magyars, and now lately by the Czechs of Bohemia in that Empire. And the world has never seen, it seems to me, such a heroic struggle for the preservation of sovereignty as has been shown by the fight of the Boers against the dominion of Great Britain. I do not enter upon the merits of that controversy at all; I only instance it in proof of what I have said, that the tendency of our time is toward the increase of the number of independent sovereign states in Christendom, instead of their consolidation into a universal empire.

Now, how is that going to be helpful to international arbitration? It seems to me one of the most potent of the forces promising success of the movement, because it is obvious that these little sovereign states which are multiplying and insisting on autonomy can only have their ambition gratified by the general acceptance of some plan which will enable a combination of a great number of them to defy the aggression of any one or any two of the larger states of Christendom.

The difficulty, of course, has always been that any scheme of compulsory arbitration, by federation or otherwise, inevitably means the surrender of a portion of the sovereignty of independent powers. This it is that has made so difficult the bringing about even of the Hague tribunal. Nations have clung tenaciously to the idea that it was *infra dignitatem* to yield to any power or combination of powers the decision of what a state should do or should not do in any particular emergency.

Difficult as it is to contrive any adequate sanction for the judgments of courts for settling disputes between nations, I entirely concur in what was so forcibly said by Dr. Strong of the tremendous power of educated public opinion as a substitute for the force of arms in compelling obedience to law. As he said, we all know that social ostracism is vastly more potent than any form of fine or even imprisonment in compelling obedience to judgments of our criminal courts. But then, as he also said, it is after all true that the one great force is in the education of public opinion, in the broadening of Christian principles, in the extension of the feeling of brotherhood between nation and nation.

We have to remember that the coming peace of the world for which we are all struggling is after all the ideal society; and, as John Locke said, an ideal government is not compatible with an ideal society, because an ideal society will require no government. The same thought was put more forcibly still by the glorious old jailer in "Cymbeline," when he said: "I would we were all of one mind, and one mind good. I speak against my present profit, but my wish hath a preferment in 't."

MR. A. K. SMILEY: I would like to call upon Dr. Trueblood to make one statement in regard to the danger that states having a decision rendered against them will repudiate it, because that question is often discussed in these Conferences.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: Replying to Mr. Smiley's question, I may repeat what I said this morning, that there have been about two hundred cases of arbitration between nations, and in not a single case has any nation, great or small, repudiated the award. In one case, that of our Northeastern Boundary, our Senate, to which the subject was referred by the President, refused to approve the judgment of the arbitrator because he had gone beyond competency and laid down a new boundary line, instead of determining what the line was that had been prescribed by the treaty with Great Britain. This case was afterwards settled by compromise in the Webster-Ashburton treaty.

It has been stated by the last speaker that peace has only come about generally during the past as the result of universal empire. There is at least one significant exception. At the close of the Napoleonic campaigns there was held the first important international congress of modern times, the Congress of Vienna; and the result of the deliberations of that Congress, which was composed of representatives of all the powers of Europe of any importance, was about forty years of general peace throughout the whole of Europe. There was no empire behind it. It was the pacific coöperation of the independent European nations which produced the greatest period of peace in modern history. That, I think, is likely to be the method of the future, the method of which arbitration is one of the most conspicuous exemplifications.

THE CHAIRMAN: The topic is now open for five-minute talks: let us hear promptly from those who have a mind to speak.

CHARLES RICHARDSON: I think it is very clear to all of us that in the last analysis the permanent success of international arbitration must rest with the majority of the people. That majority undoubtedly is composed of the wage-earners, and so far as they are organized, so far as they have expressed an opinion on this subject, I think it would be very interesting if some one would give us a little information. I think the position of organized labor in different countries in regard to war and in regard to international arbitration is a matter of great importance. It is one of the forces which we ought to take into account.

HON. R. D. BENEDICT: It is very desirable to maintain clearness of ideas in this discussion, and I beg leave to say that to me there is a confusion of terms in speaking of "compulsory arbitration." The two words seem to me entirely incompatible. War is a system of force, of settling disputes by might; arbitration is a system of settling disputes by agreement, and those who speak of "compulsory arbitration" apply the epithet of compulsion, which comes from the system of force, to the system of agreement.

It is undoubtedly true that those ideas are often joined together, and they form, when so joined, one of the difficulties in the way of establishing arbitration; because people have the idea that you

must have compulsion, and they say, "Where are you going to get your compulsion?"

It seems to me that that idea should be strenuously put out of sight. We should all say, in arguing for arbitration, that what we are desiring to obtain is a system of agreement, and that if we can establish a system of agreement it will be, as we believe, carried out of itself, and will be, by so being carried out, better for the world than the system of force. If, on the other hand, it is found that the system of agreement, when once fairly tried, is a failure without the application of force, then the world will only be back where it was in the beginning, and we shall have to apply the old principles and return to the old system of settling disputes by force.

It is my belief that if the system of settling disputes by agreement, the arbitration system, is once put fairly in operation, compulsion will never be found to be necessary.

REV. G. P. MAINS: It seems to me that it is wellnigh impossible to over-estimate the importance of what was referred to by our Chairman, namely, the enlightened self-interest of merchandise. The world is, as it never was in history before, one business community. It is true historically, as has been said, that under the Antonines peace was maintained because one undisputed sovereignty held sway over the world. But I submit that a sovereignty more potent than any of the ancient ones is abroad to-day, in the universal, international commercial interests that bind community to community and nation to nation. It is very obvious that there could be no serious war between any of the great nations that would not in such measure interfere with the universal commercial interests of mankind as to create in advance, by its mere imagination, the most potent protest against war. This seems to me a very encouraging thing. The wars which have occupied our attention recently have not been between great nations, but they have been waged by great nations on peoples of a lower civilization. We cannot, I say, over-estimate the importance of the commercial interests of civilization in their practical working as an irresistible factor toward the establishment of arbitration, as it may be needed.

Another element looking in the same direction, which has not been emphasized this evening, is the humane spirit that is possessing all thought to-day as never before. Mankind thinks more tenderly, more benevolently, of mankind than was ever the case in any preceding age. This is an age of great combinations in the business world, an age which is making phenomenal and colossal fortunes; but the hopeful and significant thing in connection with this great capitalistic movement is that there is, as never before, a search on the part of men possessing great wealth to know where that wealth may be best bestowed in the upbuilding of those institutions of civilization which will carry blessings in their train.

It seems to me that this age, if one has eyes to see the movements that are abroad, is prophetic as no other, and it is an age of rapid

culminations. I feel in my heart to-night that we need not despair. We may be full of hope that the very near future will bring the dawn of the day which will be a day of peace for this earth which has been in the centuries past so cursed by the barbarism of war.

A. K. SMILEY: "Compulsory arbitration" has been referred to; it is a bad expression. We do not believe that there should be an army to carry out the decisions of the Court at The Hague. The proper phrase is "obligatory arbitration."

THE CHAIRMAN: The fact is that the Hague Treaty is no treaty at all, in the sense that it requires any nation to accept arbitration. It is simply a declaration that arbitration is a good way of settling disputes, and then it provides a tribunal for this purpose.

PRESIDENT W. W. BIRDSALL: I suppose it is true that every intelligent person looks at the current of events from a different standpoint, and it is very likely that no two persons reach the same conclusion. In my teaching I confess that I have not observed some of the results that certain of my fellow teachers say they have seen. The young people whom I have seen in school and college have been enthusiastic upon the promotion of peace. There is no lesson in the history of the United States that I have seen learned with greater ardor, or appreciated more thoroughly, than those pages of the book of history which tell about the award on the subject of the Alabama Claims.

I want my Quaker boys to grow up abhorring war, but I confess that I shall be willing for them to study history as history has to be told. I shall even be willing for them to learn some of the details of the number of people who marched up the hill and never came down again. If they are to grow into intelligent men, they must know the things that have happened, and they can never learn the lessons of history if they do not know what awful things have occurred in this world.

But we are talking to-night of the forces making for arbitration as a means of peace. Certainly it is true that in our day no nation will ever go to war which does not *want* to go to war. The force, therefore, which will make most for peace is the spread of a knowledge of the loss, the inevitable futility, of war. Every evidence which comes to our knowledge must be significant of the trend of events in that direction.

What I rose to do was merely to point out one such significant indication, as it seems to me. Men are coming to learn that war is a failure, though there be a barren victory, and the particular place in which this lesson has recently been learned is in the industrial world. The movement that recently culminated, when men from all parts of the industrial world came together in an organized attempt for the future to avoid conflict between employer and employee, seems to me very significant of the spread of the disposition to

avoid contest — significant to an unusual degree when great employers and the most trusted citizens of our nation and the heads of federated labor come together for the specific purpose of arranging for the adjustment of disputes. From this we may hope that our nation is reaching a point where it can never go to war again, because its people *will* not.

MR. C. H. BUTLER : *Mr. Chairman* : I believe that in olden times, when there was a triumph in Rome, it was customary for a slave to stand behind the victor and whisper in his ear : “Remember that you are but a man !” Now I don’t want to throw any doubts upon the progress of arbitration, or in any way to dampen the ardor of this Conference, which this year and in other years has done and will do so much to advance that cause. We must remember, however, while we are congratulating ourselves upon the advance of arbitration and are discussing the forces that lead to it, not to allow ourselves to be thrown off our guard by feeling that the advance is greater than it really is.

We hear that more than a dozen arbitrations are now pending between the nations, and that it is a matter of surprise that so many have come during the last few years. I do not think it is a matter of surprise. I think that within a few years there will be fifty or a hundred cases. Most of the arbitrations that have occurred have been practically lawsuits which have been submitted to a referee. Now in drawing attention to this I do it only for the sake of showing how the very work which has been done in that direction may possibly lead on to a greater, for there are some questions which under the present system of arbitration could never be settled by that means. I do not think there need be any fear of an award by a court of arbitration not being accepted, but there is danger that the time may come when questions may be raised between nations which cannot be settled by arbitration.

Speaking of lawsuits being referred to courts of arbitration, there are claims which no national feeling could ever force a nation to go to war about. Such is the claim which has been sent to an arbitration tribunal only this week, referred to this morning, a question as to the disposition of a fund or the liability for a debt. This question must be arbitrated, because this country would not consent that such a matter should be the cause of war ; it would be an unjust war, and the amount involved would not represent one tithe of the war’s expense. But what we must try to do is to bring the world to believe that questions of national honor can in some way be settled other than by war, and we must go on pushing the smaller matters until at last we can reach the greater.

But horrible as war is, and blessed as peace is, we must never lose sight of the fact that the time sometimes comes when a nation must assert itself. We *might* have arbitrated with Spain the question of who blew up the Maine ; it would have been a matter

of evidence, and if the blame had been placed, a proper penalty and damages could have been assessed. But the resolution of April 20th that Cuba should be free and independent could *never* have been submitted to arbitration, for the tribunal would have had to pass on questions of law, and there was no international law which would have allowed any tribunal to give a judgment that Spain was to vacate one of its own possessions.

The greatest arbitration tribunal in the world is the Supreme Court of the United States. Disputes between sovereign states which could not be settled in any other way have been going there for a hundred years, and have been decided there, and there is no public sentiment which would justify any uprising on the part of the people of any state in case that state was decided against.

What must be done is to educate public sentiment up to that point where people will see the light; but we must never lose sight of the fact that the time sometimes comes when the high political act of a nation must be above even arbitration.

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY: There are two forces that have not been mentioned, and that I think ought to be mentioned, making for arbitration. The pictures given to us to-night indicate that international arbitration may be looked for because of the many forces referred to, but there seems to be a considerable residuum of feeling that international arbitration might be established and might after being established run against a very difficult condition of affairs. It seems to me that the fear is rather justly based if arbitration is to be established by reason of the forces to which in the main our attention has been directed to-night. The commercial force which we have heard so eloquently described is governed largely as yet by selfishness, and the selfish tendency of mankind runs to conflict as well as otherwise.

We have had no allusion made to the widely disseminated information respecting the results of war in itself, in its ulterior effects, and particularly to the enormous cost of war, and how that cost is going to be scattered among the people, as is given in the newspaper of to-day with so much detail. I think that is the force which will be more rapid and effective in its operation on public opinion than the commercial force.

But after all, it seems to me that the one force which we ought to think upon in this presence is the force exerted by the Society of Friends. That Society is old and goes back a long way, and many of you remember the time when it had perhaps a larger and a profounder respect from a larger proportion of the people than it has now; but its influence has been great in the last few years. The Society of Friends has typified the ideal state of society, and it has pointed us to the infinite God who has revealed himself to us in a man who did not believe in war.

The Conference then adjourned.

Third Session.

Thursday Morning, May 29, 1902.

THE Conference was called to order at 10 o'clock by the Chairman.

Before the commencement of the morning's discussion Mr. Smiley announced that the New York sculptor, Mr. Aloys Loehner, who was present, had with him a model of a proposed peace monument on which he was engaged, which would be sure to give delight to all the lovers of peace, and the members of the Conference were invited to inspect it after the session.

The subject of the morning's discussion was announced to be "The Education of Public Opinion," and Mr. Edwin D. Mead of Boston was introduced as the first speaker.

ADDRESS OF EDWIN D. MEAD.

THE EDUCATION OF PUBLIC OPINION.

Mr. President and Friends: Mohonk, it seems to me, is the "Mayflower" of the arbitration movement here in America. Those of us who have been privileged to be invited here year after year find in the beauty of this place very much that matches the beautiful name "Mayflower." But the ship so beautifully named, which brought our stern fathers to the New England coast, brought only — and we are glad of it — a company of saints. Now it is only a company of saints, of the converted, who come here to Mohonk, — who are gathered in this "Mayflower." The great necessity of this movement in which we are interested is that its power should be brought more directly to the unconverted. It is a good thing to have prayer-meetings; those of us who indulge in them or avail ourselves of them get strengthened by them to go out and bring ourselves to bear better upon the unconverted. But it seems to me that we need — and that this is one of the most imperative things in our propaganda at this juncture — that we need to have Mohonk Conferences in the midst of the unconverted. I wish that a movement might be started in this place to bring about an effort in that direction. I wish that those of us, for instance, who live in Boston — and, indeed, with Dr. Trueblood and others in our midst, we have been more blessed in Boston perhaps than people in other cities — I wish that all of us from Boston might go home resolved that every year there shall be a Mohonk Conference in Boston; and

that you from New York and Philadelphia and Baltimore and Chicago might go home with the same resolve. It is in the great cities that meetings of this kind need to be held. The great cities are the places where meetings are well reported, where there is newspaper discussion, where there are large constituencies, where influences radiate; and in such international conventions in our great cities seeds would be sown that would spring up in a hundred smaller places.

I have, as our Chairman has said, been in Europe this last year, looking up the machinery and the general condition of the peace movement, and I am convinced that there is no movement on earth of anything like equal importance which is so poorly provided for, so inefficiently administered, or kept so inadequately before the eyes of the people. I am glad to say that our American Peace Society has the most prominent and the best equipped office of any in the world; but this society is not half well enough endowed, it has not by any means the equipment it ought to have, and its rooms are not half prominent enough. There ought to be in every city of this land, upon one of its broadest ways, some headquarters where peace literature and the peace movement should be kept prominently under the eyes of the people. I greatly admire the worldly wisdom of my Christian Science brethren in Boston. They took a large store on one of our leading thoroughfares a while ago; they fixed up the windows in handsome shape, they put flowers there, they printed "Christian Science Reading Room" in large gold letters on the window, they made it in every way attractive, hospitable and conspicuous; and hundreds of people drop into that room to read the books and tracts spread on the tables and to buy them and carry them home. In most of the cities of Europe which I visited,—it is so everywhere, in fact, outside of London,—one has to hunt painfully and long for some little office in some out-of-the-way part of the city to find that there is such a thing as a peace propaganda being carried on there at all. Is the case any better in New York? Is it any better in Chicago, or San Francisco? I suspect it is worse. Now all that ought to be changed. There ought to be enough worldly wisdom among the business men and the educational men in a convention like this to change all this so far as America is concerned, and to change it now.

The Peace Society here in America—I have spoken of its admirable office in Boston, you all know its splendid newspaper; but the money available for its work is ridiculously small. It accuses every one of us that it is so small; that Dr. Trueblood and those working with him in Boston do not have half money enough year by year to do the little that is all they can do when so much needs to be done. It accuses every one of us if the organ of the Peace Society here in America is not in his family; it accuses us that the machinery of this work in America is not made adequate and is not properly and generously supported.

The literature of the peace movement is large and is magnificent,

but almost all of it is unavailable in cheap and attractive form. You find the orations of Sumner in the great volumes; you find "The True Grandeur of Nations" in a small edition; and there are the various tracts which we all recognize the value of, and which I hope most of us help to circulate; but much of the best of the peace literature is really not available at all to the general public. I am glad to say that one of our Boston publishers,—and I want to name him, Mr. Edwin Ginn, because such a man is to be praised—is at this moment undertaking the publication of a great deal of this peace literature in cheap and available form. He has brought out this very week in a handsome volume sold for fifty cents—heretofore it has cost two dollars—Bloch's invaluable work on "The Future of War." He is to bring out in pamphlet form Sumner's three peace orations, Bushnell's "Growth of Law," and pamphlets by Bloch, Lawrence, Novikow and others. I do not doubt that gradually he will bring out a hundred pamphlets; and so this particular desideratum will in great measure be met. Much must be done to bring this literature when it is available into the hands of the clergymen of this country, into the newspaper offices, into the public libraries, and into every centre where public opinion is formed. You and I can coöperate here; and it is a commanding duty.

Charles Sumner in his will left a sum of money to Harvard University, the interest of which was to be given every year for a prize for the best essay upon means of settling international disputes in a more rational way than by war. Numbers of the best young men at Harvard have in these years competed for that prize, so that there is a very considerable number of Harvard graduates who have had their minds seriously drawn to that subject. The young man who took the prize last year, writing an essay which ought to have been printed in the Boston newspapers or in the magazines, was a conspicuous member of the Law School. Now there ought to be established a similar prize in every college and every university in this country. Where is the rich man who will provide for this in every one of our colleges, naming the prizes everywhere the Sumner prizes, in honor of our great American prophet of peace? There ought to be great bodies of young men growing up fixing their attention upon this subject; and as their numbers become large, they should be gathered into a society devoted to the cause, with its yearly conventions. Miss Thomas, among the many splendid things that she uttered last night, said nothing that seemed to me more important than this, that not half enough is done to bring this matter of international peace and order to the attention of the young women in college, and the same thing is true of the young men in college. A vast deal needs to be done in this way; and this is but one of many ways of which I should like to speak.

The fact is, we peace people have been very shabby, we have been very parsimonious, in supporting and pushing our cause. I am glad to be told that the subscriptions to our American Peace Society have been better this last year than ever before; but when

the most is said, it is, I say, a shabby and parsimonious exhibition. There is enough power, there is enough influence, represented in a body like this to put the peace movement upon a respectable financial basis in this country—where it does not stand to-day, and where it ought to stand.

I like to remember that one of the dearest friends of Charles Sumner was the poet Longfellow. Charles Sumner once said that the greatest service which the Springfield arsenal ever did to America was to inspire Longfellow's poem upon the folly and shame of all arsenals. You remember, some of you, some of the closing lines of that poem :

“ Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals and forts.”

Why are we spending our thousands and millions upon our arsenals and forts and gunboats and great engines of destruction? It is because we have not spent our hundreds and thousands with a decent generosity upon the spread among the people of such ideas as would make the wars which we lament impossible. Money has got to be spent for these things. We have got to have not only fuller newspaper attention, but lecture bureaus and all those agencies which every cause that is making an impression upon the public employs. I am glad that our friend, Mr. Perris, the editor of the English paper *Concord*, is coming over to America next autumn to lecture. See to it, friends, that good hearings are provided for him in all your cities. I hope that more and more such men will come to our country on such errands, and that we can send Dr. Trueblood to England—and to France and Germany, for that matter, because he seems to be at home in pretty much all languages; that we can have this interchange of lecturers, bringing international thought into free communication and free influence all over the world.

More has got to be done in our libraries to reach the young people. I was pleased, making a study recently of the life and work of William Ladd, the early hero of the peace cause in America, the founder of our American Peace Society, to know that much of his literary activity was devoted to the young. Those three or four little books which he wrote to promote intelligent attention to the peace cause among the young are now out of print and are forgotten; but the fact that they were written is a witness to that noble man's sagacity. Let some of us follow his example.

The religious and educational conventions have not given any adequate or considerable attention to this great cause. I go back to Boston to be there on Saturday at the annual convention of the Free Religious Association, and I am glad to say that that convention is to devote its entire day to this cause. The religious conventions and the educational gatherings of many kinds should

make this a feature of their work more and more. I am glad to say that the Greenacre summer school is to devote its two months' session this summer very largely to this cause.

A suggestive and pregnant thing was said to me yesterday by our good friend, Professor Bracq. It happened that when Professor Bracq wanted a few years ago to get a farm, he was sensible enough to come over into Cheshire County in New Hampshire, where I was born, near to Keene. Professor Bracq said, "If you and Mrs. Mead will help me, we will get Dr. Hale, and we will stir up the local clergy, and we will have a Mohonk Conference in Keene." We propose to do that very thing; and I believe that in many cases in our summer life such conferences could be arranged. I commend the thought to you as you go into your summer quarters.

The schools must be captured for peace. I am glad to say that in Boston, in connection with our Old South work, which is chiefly for getting at the young people of the schools, but which takes in the teachers, our last winter's course for teachers was devoted to the subject of "Men who have Worked to Organize the World," and I think it proved a most interesting subject for the teachers who gathered to listen to the lectures. That is the sort of thing that can more and more be done for the teachers and the schools; and when there are at the head of the state educational machinery men like Mr. Skinner, who spoke here last night, we are sure that there is a force available which can do much to inspire proper sentiment as to what true patriotism and true history are.

This whole matter of the teaching of what true patriotism is and what it is not has been neglected, to the great prejudice of our education and the prejudice of our public opinion. It is pitiful, the things that are being circulated to-day in the schools of my own State of Massachusetts in the name of patriotism,—things, however, that I trust will in due time be thoroughly exposed.

There is no subject on which our people are more at sea than on this of patriotism. I saw the other day a picture which was one of the most mournful I ever saw, but one of the most natural,—mournful precisely because so natural. It was a picture which bore the title, "A Lesson in Patriotism,"—and the picture was of an old man in his shirt-sleeves showing a boy a gun. Now I say that was the most natural picture in the world and the most natural title; but it is the precise measure of our civilization—or of our barbarism. The fact is that the general public has got no further yet in this whole question of patriotism than that the gun is the natural symbol of it. All honor to the gun when it is used in its place,—I am not the kind of man to apologize for Lexington or Bunker Hill; but so long as the boys and girls of this country grow up with the notion that the gun and the soldier are the only proper symbols of patriotism, then we are yet, I say, in the ages of barbarism.

We read that Congress in a great wave of patriotism appropriates fifty million dollars for forts, and so forth. We read of no wave of patriotism when money is appropriated for improving the country.

Patriotism is stirred by the names of Miles or Dewey or Sampson, — and that is right, for patriots they are; but we need to know that Jane Addams at Hull House, that Eliot making men at Harvard or Tucker at Dartmouth, that John Fiske writing history, that Mayor Low giving New York a good city government, that Edward Everett Hale preaching his sermons, are also patriots, and on a vastly higher level and using vastly better tools. Up to date, I say, — and it is the measure of our degradation, — the gun is still the natural symbol of our patriotism; but it is for us to change that, and make better symbols more natural.

I was exceedingly glad of that courteous rebuke which Professor Bracq gave us yesterday. There is a strong notion abroad in this country and England that the Anglo-Saxon race is a sort of modern Israel that has the right to sweep the Amalekites and the Hivites and the sundry Canaanites out of the world when they block its way, but that when the Frenchman or the Spaniard is up to cruelties it is barbarism. It is imperative that we should be shamed out of this racial prejudice which is instrumental in so much evil to the world. The Chinese have called themselves for centuries the "Celestials," God's own peculiar people; the Jews did it; and you may remember how Dante labored to prove the Roman people the chosen people. Now when people have a notion that they have a divine commission to do right and render service, it is a good thing; but when they think that they have a divine commission for iniquity, then it is well that other people, perhaps more modest in their claims, should call them to account.

We want to educate public opinion at this moment, — I wish that Dr. Hale were here to say it, but he charged some of us to say it for him as well as we could, — we want to educate public opinion to appreciate more deeply what the importance of the Hague tribunal is, what the importance of the recent Pan-American conventions is, of which we have heard all too little. Every one of us in his place, as an agent for creating public opinion, and as a good American citizen, must do his part to make these things effective. They are the epoch-making things in our movement.

One thing more. Dr. Hale came here year after year to talk about a permanent tribunal, — and we have seen it established; but the main things we want to undertake now are the great constructive measures which shall make collisions between nations impossible, or make them unlikely, so that there will be little ever to go to the tribunal. As Dr. Hale has said here year after year, "A Permanent Tribunal!" I hope that Dr. Trueblood will come year after year and say again what he said yesterday — and no matter what else is said in this meeting, that will remain, in my opinion the most important thing, "A Congress of Nations!" A commission to settle the boundaries of nations is needed; but a score of important matters call likewise for international legislative action. Henry of Navarre saw that important thing three centuries ago; William Penn emphasized it; and we need to emphasize that

the unity of the world must be sooner or later a legislative and not merely a judicial unity. It is by the policy which shall remove boundary disputes and other disputes, and which shall help men to deal constructively with these international questions, that the peace of the world which we work for will come; and to that constructive programme let us dedicate ourselves anew this year.

THE CHAIRMAN: One point to which Mr. Mead has alluded especially impresses me because of my personal experience regarding it,—the importance of circulating cheap literature upon the subject, and especially of putting it into the hands of young people who are receiving their education. One of the most lasting impressions I received during my course of study was from a pamphlet which I came across, Sumner's oration upon "The True Grandeur of Nations." It so strongly impressed itself upon me that I purloined ideas from it for several essays and addresses while I was in college, and it has been in my mind ever since.

The Hague has become our Mecca. There the great Conference met that was in part the realization of our hopes; and yet we have heard that there is much to do to make the Hague tribunal effective. We have present with us to-day one of my colleagues, who has represented this government at The Hague, Hon. S. R. Thayer of Minneapolis, former Minister to The Hague, who will next address us.

ADDRESS OF HON. S. R. THAYER.

OUR CHIEF HOPE AN EDUCATED PUBLIC OPINION.

Mr. Smiley, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I can hardly refrain at the outset from expressing my sense of gratitude in having as the presiding officer of this Conference my former chief, a gentleman of large diplomatic experience, one who has done much in the way of composing international differences, a statesman and a publicist to whom we are deeply indebted for many highly valued instructions. I am not here because I expect to be of the least service in the solution of the difficult problems with which you have to deal, but solely to signify the interest that I now feel and long have felt in the work of this Conference.

We are told, very truly, that nations are independent moral persons existing for their own happiness and for the improvement of mankind. They are therefore subject to the same moral laws which govern individuals, and it seems to me that one of the most important questions of the hour is, How can we best make this truth effective in national life?

I am sure there are very few in civilized countries who to-day hold with Burke that war, though a means of wrong and violence, is nevertheless the only means whereby justice can be secured among nations. I think the more popular, and certainly the more

correct, view is that war is *malum in se* — wrong in itself — and can be justified only in extreme cases and generally where it is purely defensive in its character.

Now I am not as optimistic as Mr. Trueblood and several gentlemen who have spoken, because I do not believe that we have yet reached, or are even fast approaching, that period in history spoken of by a certain French philosopher as the end of the material and the beginning of the moral act, for the numbers are few of those who to-day believe that the same sense of moral responsibility rests upon that political entity which we call the state as that which belongs to the individuals composing it.

I have observed that the dominant idea running through all these discussions is, that our chief hope lies in an educated, Christianized public opinion. We know that our government is one of public opinion only; the same force which Lord Palmerston long ago asserted to be the great power in modern Europe to-day as truly supports the thrones of the Old World as it does the system of government under which we live. So I think our chief encouragement comes from the efforts which are being made everywhere for the education of public opinion, and especially through such instrumentalities as this Conference and assemblages of like character, all animated by a zeal produced by the conviction of the unrighteousness of war and a belief in the ultimate triumph of the principle of arbitration.

To my own mind these signs are vastly more significant for good than that recent manifestation of feeling at The Hague, known as the Hague tribunal, or the Hague treaty, initiated by Russia and assented to by various powers for reasons not yet clearly understood, the results of which are scarcely proportioned to the grandeur of the undertaking. In this remark I do not wish to minimize the possibilities of the work of that Conference, but only to say that, in my opinion, the motives which influenced that gathering are somewhat misleading.

My views on this subject are doubtless influenced by a single chapter in my own experience which it perhaps may not be improper for me to relate in this connection. You remember that in the year 1890 we had a Pan-American Conference in Washington, called by the President of the United States for the purpose of promoting a better understanding with our South American neighbors and instituting means to that end. Among the measures considered and adopted by that conference was a scheme of international arbitration which provided that controversies of every name and nature affecting the states and nations interested should be submitted to arbitration, with the single exception of causes involving either national honor or national independence. After this scheme or proposal had received the signatures of the majority of the members of that conference, a resolution was passed requesting the President of the United States to submit the question to foreign nations for consideration and action. It happened at that time that I held a

diplomatic position at The Hague, and it therefore fell to my lot to submit the matter to the Dutch government. It occurred to me at once that a nation that maintained an army of eighty thousand men merely to support her neutrality would not hesitate over any proposition looking in the direction of general disarmament; hence I was not surprised to learn a few days thereafter that the proposal had met the cordial endorsement of the Dutch Parliament. My present recollection is, that Holland is the only continental power that gave the matter any attention whatever. Two or three years thereafter I happened to be in London, and, learning that this proposal was to be the topic of discussion at an evening session of the House of Commons, I secured a seat, and was privileged to listen for two hours and a half to Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, while he gave a full exposition of his views on this subject. After announcing his lifelong adherence to the principle of arbitration, he stated that he believed it would be unwise for England, at that time, to assent to this particular scheme or to any scheme looking in that direction. The chief reasons that he gave for his views were that the adoption of this proposal would involve a resignation of sovereignty, that it would be of no binding force, that it might embarrass the government in settling disputes then pending between England and other powers; also that it would be a confession of weakness and militate against the high moral position which England had always held among the nations. I think he also observed that he doubted the practicability of any permanent tribunal, believing that in case of a controversy between two powers they could ordinarily select a tribunal that would be more adequate for the adjustment of the dispute in question than any standing tribunal could be. There was nowhere from the beginning to the end of the discussion any reference to those broader relations which England sustains to the entire human race, or to that feeling of sympathy which exists between man and man everywhere; in other words, there was a clear line of discrimination drawn between individual duty and the duty of the individual acting for the state in a representative capacity.

A few years thereafter I happened to be in Washington when the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was before the Senate for ratification. A very influential senator made the observation that he was opposed to the treaty because it was against American interests. Nevertheless, he said it might be well to ratify it if it gave England any satisfaction, since, if the neutralization of the Nicaragua Canal should, as in case of war, prove to be detrimental to American interests, the canal would be shut up, treaty or no treaty.

It goes without saying that no treaty or convention or protocol or *modus vivendi*, or agreement of any sort among nations, can be of the slightest value unless we have a public opinion so pronounced upon the sanctity of such engagements as to render it practically impossible for statesmen to indulge in reflections such as those just stated, to say nothing of openly expressing them.

Sixty years and more have passed away since Mr. Webster, in that interesting controversy with Lord Ashburton over our northeastern boundary question, voiced the sentiment of the people of that time when he defined diplomacy in its highest conception to be nothing more nor less than fair and honorable dealing among nations. Mr. Seward, at a still later day, said he did not believe it possible for the United States ever to be involved in war with a foreign power, for we would not knowingly do injustice to any other nation; hence a simple statement of our grievance would in any case bring the offending party to terms. The public sentiment of the civilized world would be with us, and that would be irresistible.

I presume no one in this assembly would be willing to admit that there has been any decline of national virtue since the days of Webster and Seward; but if there should chance to be one who feels that our moral position has been in any sense weakened since the Hague Convention, in which we were so prominent, by reason of events that have occurred since that day, permit me to say that I do not believe such fact furnishes any ground whatever for discouragement, but rather should have the effect to stimulate us to renewed effort to bring the American people up to higher levels of thought and activity, and so avert the modern tendency to place questions of national honor before the more important considerations of right and duty.

President W. W. Birdsall, of Swarthmore College, was next introduced, and spoke as follows :

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT W. W. BIRDSALL.

INFLUENCE OF THE HIGHER INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING ON PUBLIC OPINION.

Mr. President and Friends : I was reminded yesterday morning, when our Chairman made an announcement of the rule of debate, that we are to discuss the affirmative view of the question of international arbitration, of the story of an eastern traveler stopping at a western house of entertainment. When he came to order his breakfast he expressed a desire for beefsteak, poached eggs, potatoes, a cup of coffee. The waiter said, "Stranger, you don't want none of them things!" The traveler looked up and said, "Why so?" and he met looking down at him one of those terrible instruments which survive nowhere, I think, except in the pages of our comic journals,— what the western man used to call his "gun,"— and the voice of the waiter had assumed a stern tone as he said, "Stranger, you want hash!" It is fortunate for us, in coming to Mohonk, that those who do not want arbitration hash have politely sent their regrets and stayed at home, for we are all here of one mind as we are in one place.

Public opinion is often in a fluid condition ; it is fixed, it becomes

tradition and social order, when the substance contained, as it were, in solution is sufficiently great in quantity to crystallize, defining itself in rigid lines according to its inherent nature; and it grows to this condition of saturation and of concentration in ways and by processes too finely graded for human discernment or observation. It is the unseen work of numberless people and numberless forces, going on in ways which we cannot definitely observe, which is responsible at the last for the crystallization of public opinion; but it is events which bring about that crystallization. The force of concentration goes on quietly, unnoticed, undiscernible; but suddenly something happens, some foreign object drops in and the needles shoot out according to the law of their nature, and the crystal is formed. And thus it is in the formation of public opinion: the thought of one grows to be the thought of two and three; and so the minds of men are gradually turned unknowingly toward the truth, when suddenly an event brings to their realization the lines upon which they have been moving, and we say, "Public opinion is formed." Such processes have been going on among us, and public opinion, it seems to me, is crystallizing more rapidly in this particular direction than some of us are aware.

I believe it is true that since the events which have been referred to by the last speaker public opinion has been crystallizing, and I do not think that an English statesman to-day would rely so firmly upon war as the expression of the dominant thought of the Anglo-Saxon people as did Mr. Gladstone ten years ago. Men are educated by tax paying, the public is educated by public loss, the public mind responds to the logic of events. And it seems to me that if anything is clear from the barbarous happenings of these recent years, it is that military operations are in our day inevitably futile where both sides are well equipped. For myself, I do not believe that any great nation can again go lightly to war against another great nation, not only because public sentiment has been formed more definitely upon lines of justice and right thinking, but because men have discovered by means of the inevitable trend of events that things are impossible which twenty-five years ago could be done. The world moves, and if our sense of justice has not been cultivated in the degree necessary for us to come deliberately and of choice to this conclusion, then we shall be forced to it because we absolutely cannot escape it.

But what I wanted especially to do was simply to point out one of the great forces which it seems to me are now forming public opinion to a degree that has never before been true,—I mean the conscious educational force of our higher institutions of learning. There has been in recent years an extension of college and university work in this country like to nothing that has ever taken place in the world before. Every college president is going up and down the land asking for money to match that other money that has been given, if only the sum can be completed, and dormitories are springing up on many a hillside, and laboratories beside them; and

in these college halls and in these laboratories new science is being taught—the science of history, of economics, of sociology, and these sciences lead inevitably to the just view, to the view that a man should be a citizen not of his own country only, but of all lands and of the world. Economics is no longer the dismal science of Adam Smith; it now deals with those higher laws of human intercourse and human well-being which will make us citizens indeed of this larger nation of the world. No honest-minded youth studies the progress of economic relations in these later days without learning how men have come to see the futility of angry contest.

No just man, it seems to me, studies that science or sociology or history without learning that after all it is impossible, as Socrates said, for any man to be a good citizen without justice. And certainly this latter-day view of the relations of men must lead to the conclusion that it is impossible for a nation to claim the allegiance of just men if it itself is not just in its dealings with other nations.

We had been talking, some of us whose profession is teaching, about the importance of the individual,—how great is the work of the good teacher, how important the work of one man. President Eliot said: “Yes, yes, that is true, the work of the individual in the community cannot be too highly estimated; but institutions are greater than men, and the greatest thing a man can do is to build a few bricks into an institution which will continue after him and do for succeeding generations what he has tried to do for his own.” So I like to think that the men who framed our American Constitution built into the walls of a great institution, not a few, but many bricks. So I think the men who organized the Hague Court have set up an institution which will do for coming generations what they would like to have done for their own.

The Chairman next introduced the Rev. F. B. Allen of Boston.

ADDRESS OF REV. F. B. ALLEN.

THE TEACHING OF PATRIOTISM.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Now that the deciding vote for peace or war has passed from a little band, who may feel their responsibility, to the great mass of the people, there comes a profounder necessity than ever before for a thorough work of education upon the *whole* people, not merely upon our universities or colleges or chambers of commerce. There ought to be a more intelligent, a wiser education of the boys and girls and the great mass of our population who are *not* attending our higher educational institutions. And especially what needs to be done is to afford a teaching of patriotism which shall separate it from militarism.

I have here the account of a catechism or primer of patriotism prepared by the Grand Army of the Republic in Massachusetts. It has been sent to two or three hundred schools. Thirty or forty

thousand copies of this primer have been printed, and they are to be used to-morrow in the Decoration Day exercises. This is a "Primer of Patriotism ;" and what do you suppose is the first question which all these boys and girls are to be asked, and are supposed to answer? I will read it to you, with a few of the subsequent questions and answers.

Question. What is the first "position" of a soldier?

Answer. Erect, feet firmly placed, heels touching, toes spreading slightly outward, the shoulders thrown back, eyes to the front.

Ques. Why are these things required?

Ans. That he may be in the best form to give attention.

Ques. What is the first "duty" of the soldier?

Ans. Obedience.

Ques. What kind of obedience?

Ans. Quick and unquestioning obedience.

Ques. Why is this demanded?

Ans. Because good order can be had in no other way.

Ques. What is patriotism?

Ans. Love of one's country and willingness to make sacrifices for it.

Ques. Why should American boys and girls be patriotic?

Ans. Because they have a better chance to make the most of themselves than any children in the world.

Ques. What organization to-day makes a specialty of teaching patriotism?

Ans. The Grand Army of the Republic.

Now, my friends, there is not one of us here but would be glad to-morrow to lay his laurel wreath upon the graves of the brave soldiers who fought in the great War of the Rebellion. There are none of us but hold in honor the dwindling survivors of the great army of the North that fought for the Union, and yet among those survivors there are some men of even like passions with ourselves; and when we remember the record of the Grand Army of the Republic toward the question of pensions, we may hesitate to take them as the exclusive teachers of disinterested patriotism.

But what I wish to say especially is this: When it comes to teaching boys and girls we must remember the fascination of the flag and the uniform and the drum beat, and we are to think how to teach them patriotism in peace. I believe that the instinct of fight, the competitive instinct, is something not to be eradicated; I believe God plants no great passion, no primary instinct, in our humanity merely to be wiped out. I believe it is to be spiritualized, it is to be consecrated, and we are bound to train this very fighting instinct and aim it against the forces of evil.

We must not talk of passive virtues or of peace as if that were everything. The very same valor which our honored President showed at San Juan he showed for very many years in the great Civil Service Reform contest. We must teach our boys and girls to fight the forces of evil within our own boundaries. Even our peace-loving host is not ashamed to borrow a military bugle to summon us to breakfast. We are to take what has been the charm of militarism and we are to consecrate it to peace and to internal conflicts which are more constant than those of the battlefield.

I am afraid that I am somewhat in danger of making too much of my own city. I honor the City of Brotherly Love, the City of Peace, but when I look at that Quaker city I sometimes wish that they would put up a little stiffer fight for righteousness.

I am perfectly sure that there needs to be trained, not for bloodshed, but for determined, strenuous, constant conflict against the forces of evil,—there needs to be trained a certain fighting instinct. I hope we shall in our schools train our children to know that there is a battle for them to fight against the spoils system, against municipal corruption, against race hostility and class prejudice; a battle against intemperance and lust.

We have plenty of foes to fight, and we have got to teach our children to feel that that is the *great* battle, and that is where the glory of fighting is going to be; that our flag stands not for carnage and bloodshed, but for purity and duty and honor and all that is noble and high in our country's career.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman who is next to address us ought to be weary in well-doing. He has been engaged for the last year or two in a great task, that of bringing about peace among those people who are known as Presbyterians. He has accomplished his task for the present at least, but I have no doubt from my acquaintance with him that he has some vigor left yet, and is willing to contribute his share to promoting peace among the nations of the earth,—Rev. Herrick Johnson, D.D., of Chicago.

ADDRESS OF REV. HERRICK JOHNSON, D.D.

THE CONQUERING POWER OF THE PASSIVE VIRTUES.

I see that our Chairman, the Hon. John W. Foster, is at the old business; he has been the watchdog of the speakers' time in our Presbyterian revision committee, and he is still doing business on the old line.

I am reminded of the fact that the education of public opinion, of which we have heard so much in this Conference, has been illustrated in the work we have been doing the last two years in the Presbyterian Church. Under the influence of time and discussion—quiet, constant, public and private—a great change has been wrought in the Presbyterian Church, so that a good many who were supposed to be absolutely immovable with respect to their convictions concerning the question of the revision of our doctrinal standards, have come to look out of other eyes, and we passed unanimously at our recent General Assembly held in New York what would have been simply impossible five years ago.

So much in favor of an educational process in connection with public opinion of any sort. And if this has been done in connection with the Presbyterian Church, what may not be done in the

whole country with respect to this matter of arbitration! Let us recognize the fact, friends, that a good deal has already been done. We have alleviated immensely the horrors of war; beyond all question, a great deal that was not only possible, but probable and almost absolutely certain, fifty years ago, is now impossible. But still the *thing* is here! The chief horror of War is *War*, and you cannot alleviate the horrors of it until you have obliterated war itself, for "War," as Sherman said, "is hell."

Yet some things have been done. This Conference has done a good deal, but it occurs only once a year and is limited. I notice, however, that I have already caught something more of the fever by reason of my attendance on this meeting, and I have seen men so affected by this Conference that they have reminded me of the fact that you cannot get very near it without getting very much influenced by it. I heard a story of a man standing by an open fire warming himself. He was bow-legged, and a little urchin waiting on the house stood watching him, and he thought he saw the bows growing, and he finally exclaimed, "Mister, mister, you had better get away from that fire, you are a-warping!" Well, now, if anybody wants to get away from the spirit of arbitration he had better keep clear of this Conference. For he will be "a-warping" just as surely as he comes within its peaceful yet potent influence.

I am not sure that I agree with the last speaker altogether, and yet in his application I thought he was a good deal better than in his exposition. One may believe intensely in the mighty efficacy of the passive virtues and yet have this belief in entire consistency with the intensest antagonism to and warfare against all forms of evil. Christ is the supreme model in this regard. No one ever antagonized evil more than he, and yet he is the author of the passive virtues. He rained his benedictions on mercy and gentleness and patience and forgiveness and suffering love, and said that these were to conquer the world—and they will. How much they have already conquered! Look at Christ eighteen hundred years ago, deserted even by his own disciples, and now all heaven's crowns are cast at his feet and millions on earth would die for him. That is the conquering power of the passive virtues. And I really believe that if we will push our education along this line we shall be at the supreme business to which we have been called of God in this opening century.

I remember that at the close of our Civil War, a number of us went down from the last service of the Christian Commission to Richmond to see some of the sights. Among other things we attended an evening school that had been opened and which was being taught every night by Christian men and women eager to teach the freedmen how to read. While we were there, they were on the Beatitudes, and when they came to this one, "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled," one little fellow looked up into his teacher's face and said, "Teacher, what does that mean? Does it mean that we want Jesus, or that we have done got him and want more of him?" That's just

what it means, and I challenge any exegete to give a better exegesis of the divine Beatitude.

Now if we will get that spirit into our lives, into our hearts, into the hearts of others, if we will go out as living beatitudes, we will do a great deal toward transforming public opinion. You can't make effective and final resistance against the sweep and power of suffering love; and while I believe in being stalwarts against sin and corruption and every form of evil, when it comes to this extirpation of the spirit of war we shall only achieve it by a suffering love. God help us to illustrate and adorn this spirit.

Let us remember that something is being done, that more is going to be done.

“The forces of the dark dissolve,
The door-way of the dark is broken;
The word that casts out night is spoken.”

THE CHAIRMAN: The next speaker hardly needs an introduction from me; he is well known for his work on one of the leading public journals which for so many years have molded the sentiment of the country. And then, while I believe we are not allowed to talk about the war,—the Spanish War in which he took a prominent part,—I think I will venture to say that he was in the Spanish War. But it was as the result of the war, and we remember the valuable service he rendered in his visit as special government commissioner to Porto Rico, and the enlightenment furnished by him to our people as to the condition and the wants of those people. Dr. H. K. Carroll will now address us.

ADDRESS OF DR. H. K. CARROLL.

MISJUDGMENTS OF OTHER PEOPLES.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen: The last occasion when I was a member of this Peace Conference was, I think, in 1898. I do not remember exactly who was the President of the Conference at that time, and I have forgotten who made the speeches, and I have forgotten all the speeches except one or two things. Those things have been seed in my mind, and what I shall give you in the brief time allotted to me this morning will be in the nature of an evolution of the seed that was dropped then by Miss Smiley.

Miss Smiley was making a speech about the Spanish War, and she was saying that she found herself reading the despatches about the progress of that war, and taking a good deal of delight in them; and she called herself to task for that, and reminded herself that the Spaniards against whom that war was being waged could not all be bad people; and she called to mind a lovely young Spanish girl whom she knew in Washington who illustrated the Christian virtues, and then she thought of other Spanish people whom she had known, and so she called herself back from the position into which she was drifting with respect to war.

I had no thought at that time, when I was listening to Miss Smiley's admirable and charming address, that I was going to be connected in any way with that war; and I was really not, because I was not in Porto Rico at the end of the war, — but what I am to say to you this morning will be in illustration of the thought that she then dropped.

I think that war very often results from misunderstanding, and that an atmosphere of hate is a very good atmosphere indeed in which to develop all the passions of war. I think that where we fail to have a thorough understanding of another nation or another people, and believe that they are bad people, and make ourselves believe that they have none of the Christian virtues, we are very ready to go to war and we are very glad when they are killed.

I have found since my return from Porto Rico that there is a great deal of misunderstanding as to the character of the Porto Ricans. I had been met by the statement: "Well, of course you found those people an immoral people, an illiterate people, a criminal people and a barbarous people." And I say, "No, I didn't find them so at all," and I give incidents to show what manner of folk they are. For example, I asked the Chief Justice of the Island how often they had a trial for murder and how often they had an execution, and he said that it was about seven years since their last trial for murder, followed by an execution. I asked him about burglaries and he said, "We know no such thing in the Island." One day I was talking with some merchants and bankers in San Juan, and I asked them how they settled their balance at the end of the year with other business houses in the Island, and they said they sent silver. They put the silver in kegs and sent it by ox cart. I said, "How large a guard of soldiers do you send with the money?" They said, "We don't send any soldiers; we send a man along beside the driver to handle the money, and we have never lost any." "Well," I said, "you cannot transport money that way in my country without danger of losing it!"

One day I was in Yauco in the southern part of the Island, there was to be a cock fight and each man carried a bag of silver to gamble with. As they came into the hotel they carelessly tossed the bags of silver on the floor, and the walls were lined with bags of silver. Then they went out for an hour or two and left the money unguarded. After dinner each man picked up his bag and went to the place where the fight was to be held. I said, "Is that a common thing?" They said it was. Then I said, "You cannot do that in any hotel in my country — except Mohonk."

As to their being barbarous, they have nothing to learn from us in regard to manners. I remember one day I was going through the interior of the Island, my stenographer had a camera and he wanted to change his films. We came to a hut, a mere shack, and he asked if he might use the darker of the two rooms. After he had made the change he thanked the woman of the house and held out a piece of silver. She was offended, and said, "No, sir; no, sir."

He, wishing her very much to take this piece of silver, said, "Well, madam, simply as a *recuerdo*, a remembrance." Then she said with inimitable grace, "Well, sir, to keep you from holding out your hand so long I will take it."

Now, if we can be so mistaken about the people of a little island that has lately become territory of the United States, it is certainly open to us very much to misjudge the character of other nations. I have been very much impressed recently in reading historical novels to see how steadily those novels having relation to the Revolutionary War, or the War of 1812, in almost every case paint the English soldier and the English officer in very black colors. It is made to appear that he is very brutal and very cruel, that he delights in doing brutal and cruel things. I am sure that we have greatly misunderstood the character of the English people until recent years. We are now coming to understand them better, and we are coming closer together; and the closer the United States and Great Britain come together the less likely it is that war shall come between them.

I am very much impressed with the opinion that our histories, at least for the young, should be written from a different standpoint. Now, a history of a government must of course include the great wars which that government has carried on; and many of the histories of England are really histories of the great wars of England, and we do not get from those histories an idea of the achievements of the English people in the arts of peace, for "Peace," as Milton has said, "has her victories no less renowned than war." While we cannot eliminate the account of battles altogether from our histories, I could wish that more histories were written from the standpoint that Mr. Green took when he wrote "A Short History of the English People." I think it would be well to have histories that shall recount the achievements of peace of the nations with which we desire to cultivate closer relations, so that we shall not look at them through distorted glasses, but shall understand just what kind of people they are; and as we learn to admire their virtues in peace, we shall learn to love and admire the people themselves.

Now, it is very easy to be willing to allow a people to be killed summarily whom we do not like, in whom we see no virtue, and whom we greatly misunderstand. I say that to misunderstand and then to cultivate the idea of hatred in our minds is to make us very willing, indeed, that war shall go on and that people shall be killed. Let us strive to gain a truer knowledge of the peoples of other lands in their social and business life.

THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion of the addresses which have been made will be opened by Lucia Ames Mead of Boston.

REMARKS OF LUCIA AMES MEAD.

THE EVILS AND OBSTACLES TO BE OVERCOME.

MRS. MEAD: Since I last stood here five years ago and addressed this audience, two great world-movements have received a tremendous impulse; these two movements are as different in their outcome as was that of the rum and missionaries which used to be sent in the same vessel to South Africa. One movement is towards an increase of armaments, the other towards the employment of disinterested judges, as a practical method of settling international difficulties. Strangely enough these two movements are advocated not only by the same nations but frequently by the same persons. The other day, in a religious weekly, I observed an article by a minister of the Prince of Peace upon "The Gun Behind the Man," in which, although he lauded the Hague tribunal, he declared there was never a time when there was more need than now for the gun behind the man. He did not see that the court behind the nation ought now to reduce the guns and the men. Never was there a more anomalous condition of things than this present increased impetus in two entirely opposite directions.

Had not Mr. Trueblood and others so admirably presented the hopeful aspect of our present situation — the glorious gains for arbitration — I should not ask your attention to this dark side of the question. It is not merely an increase of militarism that we face, but in both England and America a decrease of the democratic spirit, an apathetic attitude toward injustice, and a callousness toward cruelty. God grant it may be only temporary. The evil we must face is not merely war but something more fundamental which includes injustice between man and man as well.

Five years ago in my address here I reminded ourselves that anarchy in the form of lynching was taking root in the north and we could no longer boast of immunity from this southern crime. Scarcely were the words out of my lips when the telegraph sent us the description of the hanging of five or six white horse-thieves in Indiana; and the mob, which gave no pretense of trial and which inflicted a punishment never given by the courts for this offense, escaped even serious condemnation by its community. Then followed the lynching at Akron, Ohio, when the baffled mob blew up the court-house, destroying the town records and much property. Since then we have had the negro lynching in New York and others. Ten years ago my blood ran cold at stories of lawless vengeance by use of bullet and rope. Well do I remember the sleepless night of horror after I read the sickening details of torture and death of a negro in the flames at Paris, Texas, when a whole town turned out like Apaches to enjoy the savage spectacle. It was new to us then; but yesterday, when I read in the *New York Tribune* a similar account of a burning last week I did not lie awake over it. I hope my

conscience is not seared, but I am so inured to horrors now and so are you that our sensibilities are no longer so acute. This new insensitiveness marks for the time being a decline in national honor.

Four years ago in England, a member of Parliament said to me and spoke truly then: "We could not get such mobs in England as you have in the States, our people have more respect for law and order." Last summer he said to me: "Some of our ladies have talked like devils about the Boers this last year; there is a new spirit here and I look on in shame and amazement." At the Peace Conference at Glasgow we saw the Quaker Mr. Rowntree, whose house was injured to the extent of ten thousand dollars by the mob because he held as his guest Mr. Cronwright Schreiner of Cape Colony, whose only offense was, as a British subject, to criticize in temperate terms the government's policy. The Edinburgh mob, largely composed of students, as I was told, later nearly killed him. Free speech for many months in England was tabooed.

Our prosperous and complacent people like to ignore unpleasant facts and dub the one who mentions them as "pessimist." Never was there a word more misused except its counterpart, "optimist." The difference between the two is not a question of temperament or digestion, but of a philosophy of life. Said Phillips Brooks in one of his last sermons, "the genuine pessimist is often the most jovial and popular of men, believing little either in God or man, and therefore holding to the doctrine that it is folly to try to make the world over, he frequently takes a happy-go-lucky view of life and says, 'let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'" The optimist, however, seems often the saddest man in the community. Just because he has glorious ideals which he believes may be attained if all will labor for them, his heart aches at the cheerful scepticism of the multitude and he grows weary in bearing the burdens that they shirk. The man who takes the saddest view of militarism and anarchy is not the one who believes them to be necessary and inevitable, but the one who knows that they are not and labors night and day to abolish them.

What may the serious optimist suggest as improvements in our political machinery which will further his endeavors to promote justice and through justice, reason instead of folly, and peace instead of war? First, if the government is to be of and for and by the people, the people must be able to express its will and majorities must rule. New York city, which elects a mayor by a plurality, has just suffered four years of costly misrule by a minority. In regard to one of the two great points at issue in the last presidential election, no man can tell what was the people's will. The voter was confronted with two questions for which there was no machinery by which the opinion of many could be registered. They were situated like the mother who was a Baptist and a homeopath, and must choose for her child's guardian between a Unitarian who was a homeopath and a Baptist who was an allopath. By choice of either she would be only half satisfied.

Moreover we must cease the folly of sending representatives to

Congress who take their seats thirteen months after their election when new issues may have arisen and they know not the people's will. It is a long and troublesome process to change these defects of machinery and to get fair representation, but it must be done if we are to have democracy and justice: gerrymandering must not reverse, as it so often has in Congress, the people's will and substitute for years the will of the minority of a state for the majority. Not that the best machinery will ever keep a people pure if its heart is wrong, but machinery which frustrates justice discourages all efforts at reform, for it comes very near fooling all the people all the time. The people wanted an arbitration treaty with England six years ago, but the will of a majority of the people and a majority of the Senate was defeated by half a dozen senators from western states with very small populations.

Not only better political machinery but an untrammelled press is needed if we are to know the people's will. But the press is more and more under the control of stockholders and advertisers, and in many instances neither editors nor reporters may tell what they see and hear and think. One must usually be a constant reader of many papers of diverse political views if he is even to make a fair guess at important facts, and he must have a mind unusually judicial if he is to measure these according to their just value. Someone has expressed here great hope for peace in that the papers are spreading broadcast the arguments for peace. I do not wish to be discouraging but simply to show the obstacles which we must consider when I remind you that though the papers give space for Mr. Foster's words, they give ten times as much to Funston's and to Hobson's, and until the business interests of the country are enlisted on the side of arbitration as a substitute for armaments, it can scarcely be otherwise. We have heard a speaker claim much encouragement for the cause of peace in our recent great expenditures for education; but I must say I feel that neither new laboratories nor handsome, fireproof dormitories and splendid educational endowments made by multi-millionaires are of necessity agents for promoting justice or peace. The men who are most responsible for the Boer war are university graduates. Neither a knowledge of mechanics nor mathematics nor dead or living languages nor of physical science will teach men to be just or sympathetic or statesmanlike, if they have this learning only as an incentive. Neither does a training in systematic theology and exegesis always enable a man to preach the gospel of Jesus instead of Joshua. A young theological student asked me the other day: "What do you think of the idea that war is a good thing to kill off surplus population?" He evidently thought this doctrine which impugns the results of science and blasphemes the Creator might have some validity. A clever young poet who had the learning of the schools, held forth to me with great enthusiasm quite recently upon the glorious doctrine of the "survival of the fittest" which to his mind meant the extermination of weak and inferior races by the strong ones; he looked forward with pleasure to the day when pity

as a human sentiment would disappear and a strong, triumphant race would rule the world.

The "educated" man needs as much enlightenment on the ethics and economics of modern warfare and on arbitration as the uneducated. We have heard something said about the work of women for peace as being of great importance. I wish it were, but up-to-date women have been as ill-informed as men on this great question, and they are as likely to be misled by specious arguments. President Thomas's reference last night to the ideas of Bryn Mawr students is quite in point. Girls are fascinated by brass buttons, and in spite of studying Euclid and the Anabasis, are, like most other people, wont to base their judgment on popular catch-words. There are three which seem to comprise the average man's convictions on this question: "In time of peace prepare for war;" "You can't change human nature," and "The fittest shall survive." The misinterpretation and misapplication of this element of the doctrine of evolution is the mental stock in trade of hundreds of thousands of callow youth to-day.

If we women are indeed to do the work for peace that our peculiar privileges of leisure and influence in home and school supply us opportunities for, then we must be prepared. No mere goody-goody sentiment or zeal without discretion will avail. We must take the trouble to study and learn and have at our tongue's end the logical refutation of current fallacies and the results of the teachings of science and economics as bearing on this question. Beginning with the nursery, to which we will bring no tin swords or leaden soldiers, and teaching in schools and clubs and "patriotic" societies a true instead of a false or narrow patriotism, we will set ourselves to conquering the ignorance and prejudices around us. The most effective missionary work may often be done over the teacups and on the summer hotel piazza,—the incidental pat remark when it comes from one who knows, may carry more weight than a whole lecture. Let me tell you that one body of women, the Woman's Church Alliance of Dr. Hale's Church in Boston, are next winter going to address themselves to this task during the whole season. They mean to see what Jean de Bloch and Charles Sumner and other experts have to say on this subject, and they mean to do a little thinking for themselves besides. If the great new class of privileged women who are relieved from household drudgery, if the peripatetic class who live in family hotels and have little public spirit because they have no roots anywhere, will give one-half the time and energy that they now spend in an excess of whist and golf and French conversation lessons to studying this vital matter, they can make themselves respected instead of being ignored as an intellectual factor in the community, and moreover when they once get into it they will find it wonderfully interesting; and if the church can be led to hope for peace before the millennium, and so systematically to work for it, the need for peace meetings at Mohonk will soon cease. These are great ifs, but it is well for us to realize the present need for much more detailed study

on the part of peace workers, and to enter perhaps on some new and hopeful fields of propaganda.

MR. W. C. DENNIS, Secretary of the Conference, said that the Press Committee were doing all they could to get reports of the discussions before the public. He suggested that members of the Conference write articles about the Conference for their local papers or any paper into which they could get them.

MR. SMILEY then told the Conference that he had invited the sixty Cuban girls who were studying at the New Paltz Normal School to fit themselves for teachers in Cuba, to visit the Conference. As the girls came in and took seats in front of the parlor, the Conference rose and applauded.

EX-CONGRESSMAN LEFEVRE of New Paltz, said: During Mr. Smiley's sojourn in California it became my duty to welcome to New Paltz, President Palma, when these girls turned out in gala attire to greet him. I am proud that I had this honor, in the absence of Mr. Smiley who is President of the Local Board of the Normal School.

I am likewise proud of another thing, that I am a member of the Local Board at New Paltz that has the honor to extend its educational facilities to these teachers of Cuba.

MR. SMILEY: Most of these girls were here before Cuba became free. General Wood was very active in the matter of getting them here. The whole country was looked over and our school was chosen, to our great surprise and pleasure. Having tried us two years, Lieutenant Hanna, who had charge of the matter, said: "I want to go no further; I am satisfied with this school." I think a great deal of our success with the girls is owing to the principal of the school, Mr. Scudder. He was born in India, and he has got a good deal of the missionary in him.

PRINCIPAL MYRON T. SCUDDER: The girls for this school are selected in Cuba by means of examinations. It was thought that about two hundred would come, but as a matter of fact only sixty stood the test of the examinations. I have been engaged in educational work twenty years, and I have never met a group of students more earnest and who brought more intelligence to bear upon their work. I think they are natural born teachers; indeed, I think that they can teach better after a week or two of instruction as to the way of procedure in a class than most of our Northern girls do at the end of a year. As to support, they are paid twenty dollars a month by their government, their board and instruction are furnished them free, and at the end of two years' study here they are guaranteed positions in Cuba with salaries of nine hundred dollars a year.

HON. W. J. COOMBS: It seems to me that while the United States has been lacking in good faith in some directions, this sight is an evidence that we have become a nursing mother to the island of

Cuba. Many of the pleasantest recollections of my life centre around that island — its beautiful scenery, its palm trees, the plantations where you are received without money and without price, and where the more trouble you give the more welcome you are. Let us take Cuba under the shadow of our wing, and see that she is in every respect free, and that she does not suffer in the eyes of the world for the lack of a friend.

After Mr. Skinner, superintendent of Public Instruction in New York State, had spoken a few words concerning his visit to Porto Rico and Cuba to look into the matter of their schools, Mr. Smiley introduced Miss Armstrong, the principal of the corps teaching the Cubans at the Normal School, and he said that Miss Armstrong had spent twenty-two years of her life under the Argentine Republic establishing normal schools.

MISS CLARA J. ARMSTRONG: I hardly know what to speak about — whether to speak about the Cuban work here or about the Argentine Republic. I feel about these girls just as I did about the Spanish-American girls in South America. If you teach them and become interested in them, you find that they have not their superiors as pupils anywhere in the world. The general characteristics are the same all through Spanish-American countries, and I think it would surprise you to know the amount of study that these girls can put into a few months. They learn much more than American students do in the same time; that is due to their excessive ambition.

THE CHAIRMAN spoke to the students in Spanish and was heartily applauded by them.

The session closed with the singing of the Cuban national hymn by the Cuban teachers, with one of them at the piano, and "America," in which the Conference joined.

Fourth Session.

Thursday Evening, May 29, 1902.

The Chairman called the Conference to order at 8 o'clock, and announced that Mr. George Foster Peabody had a communication to make on behalf of the Business Committee.

MR. PEABODY: The Business Committee present the following in response to the directions to submit a minute on the death of Lord Pauncefote:

MINUTE ON THE DEATH OF LORD PAUNCEFOTE.

Resolved, That the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration of 1902, records with deep regret the recent death at Washington of the distinguished and honored ambassador of Great Britain, Lord Pauncefote.

The Conference tenders to the family of the deceased statesman and to the people of Great Britain the sincere sympathy of its members in the loss of so able and useful a diplomat and so true and noble a man.

While loyally and faithfully representing his country and its interests, Lord Pauncefote greatly endeared himself to all Americans by manifesting on all occasions toward the government and people of the United States, a sincere and unreserved friendship, which has done much to strengthen the bonds of union and fellowship between the English and American peoples.

In the promotion of the cause of International Arbitration by his services at the Hague Conference and at Washington, Lord Pauncefote's disinterested and untiring labors were universally recognized to be of the first order, entitling him to rank among the foremost diplomatic promoters of international justice and concord.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, signed by the President of the Conference, be sent to the family of the deceased statesman, and that a copy be forwarded to Secretary Hay for transmission to the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The motion that these resolutions be adopted as the sense of this Conference was carried by a unanimous rising vote.

[Since the close of the Conference, Mr. Woodruff, Secretary, who had forwarded copies of the foregoing resolution to the State Department for transmission, has received a letter from Hon. David J. Hill, assistant secretary of state, saying that the resolutions had been forwarded to the United States Embassy at London with instructions to transmit one copy to Lady Pauncefote and one to the British Foreign Office.]

The topic under consideration for the evening was: The Influence of the Industrial, Commercial and Financial Forces of the World on International Arbitration, and the addresses were limited to ten minutes.

The following gentlemen spoke: John Crosby Brown, of Brown Brothers & Co., New York; Wm. F. King, formerly president of the Merchants Association of New York; Mahlon N. Kline, of the Philadelphia Trades League; Osborne Howes, of the Boston Chamber of Commerce; Warner Van Norden, president of the Van Norden Trust Co., of New York; George Foster Peabody, of Spencer Trask & Co., New York; J. Edwards Simmons, president Fourth National Bank of New York.

ADDRESS OF JOHN CROSBY BROWN.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE LEADING TO PERMANENT PEACE.

At the first meeting of the Business Committee a self-denying ordinance was passed. It was resolved that as there were so many distinguished guests present at the Conference this season, those who had taken part in the discussions on previous occasions should hold their tongues. When, therefore, I was asked to open the discussion this evening, of course I promptly declined; but strangely enough the exceeding modesty of the great number of financial lights that are present, — a modesty I must confess I have never noticed when meeting them in the ordinary affairs of business life, — this modesty was so great that no one would consent to open the discussion. So here I am, very much as the bellwether of the flock, to lead these modest gentlemen into green pastures where they will, I am sure, delight you after I am through.

I always feel that when we enter upon the discussion of this question of international arbitration from the business standpoint, we are descending somewhat from that high ethical and moral ground, upon which its justice and its reasonableness ought always to be upheld. But in every great movement for the betterment of mankind it is wise to make use of all forces and influences that are working in that direction, and I am confident from my own experience that the various business interests of the world at large are slowly but surely making for the peace of the world.

The language employed in describing the subject that is to engage our attention this evening lifts the question just a little above the narrow limits of national self-interest to the broader plane of the world's welfare. I want to call your attention to this language. We are to consider the influence of the industrial, commercial and financial forces of the world in favor of international arbitration. The question is not the influence of these industrial, commercial and financial forces on our own country; it is not even the question of the influence of these forces at work in the Anglo-Saxon race, which sometimes we are apt, with too little modesty, to exalt at the expense of all the rest of the world. It is a broader question than that. It embraces these great forces at work in France, in Germany, in Russia, in Italy, in South America, in all the civilized countries of the world. And it is even a broader question than that. It takes in all

these forces that are at work along these same lines in the civilization of the East and of the islands of the sea. And if we are to learn anything from the experience of the past,—while of course there have been a great many commercial wars,—the more the world is brought together, the more we come to know of one another, the larger the interests that different parts of the world have at stake in other parts of the world, the greater is that bond of peace and unity that binds us together.

It is not so very long ago when, apart from the foreign trade of this country, our domestic trade and business was practically very little influenced by anything occurring outside of the country, and it scarcely had any influence whatever in the great financial centres of the world. I remember that when as a young man I was getting my business training in Liverpool, the financial news from the United States was usually confined to a few sentences in the leading morning London journal. The provincial papers—those published in Liverpool and Manchester—which were in closer touch with the United States, had perhaps a little larger space devoted to the financial and business news from this country. We were a factor that did not count for much in the great financial movements of the old world. But all this has changed. In the last few years there has been a wonderful transformation, and I venture to say that there is not an intelligent or prudent business man in any part of this country who would venture for one moment to enter upon any enterprise of magnitude without keeping his hand upon the financial pulse of the world and without noting the changes in that pulse that are brought to him every morning by the cable from the financial centres of Europe and even of the Orient. And so much is this the case that even in the management of our domestic affairs it is absolutely essential at the present time, if a man is to be up-to-date and on his guard, that he shall know something of what is going on in the great financial centres, because there can no disturbance occur, financial or political, in any part of the world that is not instantly, to a greater or lesser degree, felt in every financial centre of this country, so closely are we bound together.

Public attention has recently been called to the alarm that seems to have been occasioned in certain of the countries of Europe, by the appearance of this country as an active competitor in markets which heretofore have been considered their own, and a great many devices have been suggested to put a stop to this American aggressiveness; and as is very natural, a great many very foolish and unwise suggestions have been made, so that a good many people have been very much frightened and consider that this whole matter is a menace to the peace of the world.

Now we all know that when a man is beaten he is inclined to lose his temper, and an angry man is ready for a fight; so persons who are concerned for the welfare and peace of the world fear that from this spirit of anger and disappointment trouble will come, that this new competitor among the nations of the world is bound to bring

trouble and that the cause of international peace is somewhat in danger.

I do not myself take any such view, because already the sober second thought is becoming manifest, and thoughtful men on the other side of the Atlantic of different nationalities are beginning to ask why it is this giant youth is coming in and giving them this trouble in their own fields, and they are taking time and pains to investigate and to study the question. It is known to quite a number in this room that during this last winter one of the chambers of commerce in Germany selected some of their most prominent members and sent them over to this country as a delegation to our chambers of commerce and other industrial bodies, to investigate this question. The same thing has occurred in France, and some of us have had the pleasure of meeting these gentlemen and talking to them and giving them all the information in our power and helping them to get at the real facts that have enabled us to go into their markets and get ahead of them on their own ground.

Let us mention another significant fact. During this last winter a member of Parliament from England who came over to study this question, was so much impressed with what was going on in the development of our various industries, that he has gone back with the intention of bringing over, at his own expense, a number of young men in public and business life, and also a number of representative artisans, to study our methods and see what we are doing.

Now these gentlemen are simply doing what we did years ago. It was not done by public bodies so far as we were concerned, but when we wanted to find out how to establish any new industry, our people used to go and study all the best methods in different parts of the world and then come home and put Yankee wit and ingenuity at work to try and make them better. These people are simply trying to do the same thing.

Whether we like it or not, and whether we are willing to admit it to ourselves or not, these great industrial, commercial and financial forces of the world are all steadily and slowly at work pulling down national barriers, drawing together the races and the nations of the world into closer fellowship, and so linking us one to the other that while we shall of course still maintain our fondness for our own country and our loyalty to it, and shall try to make our own nation the best nation in the world, our interest and our welfare are so linked one to the other that it will be simply impossible for us, in the long run, to enter upon any course that is going to be an injury to our neighbors, without its reacting injuriously upon ourselves. And what is true of us is true of all the nations of the world.

For this reason I look forward with perfect confidence to the time when the Golden Rule in international trade will be the real guiding principle that will lead us into permanent peace.

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM F. KING.

COMMERCIAL ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am asked to speak on the commercial aspects of international arbitration.

My experience in commercial affairs has been continuous during a period of nearly forty years. Ever since my early boyhood days I have been an active business worker in the city of New York. It has been necessary for me to keep in constant touch with the business elements in nearly every section, to be informed of the conditions affecting the business situation, the general prosperity, and the development of each. My business relations required me to become familiar with the conditions affecting business; my mental make-up impelled me to examine into the causes of those conditions, at first locally, but later in their broader national aspects.

As a commercial traveller I annually journeyed throughout a very large part of the country, and sold merchandise in almost every state. I became profoundly interested with the differences in the degree of prosperity of different sections, where the natural conditions were equally favorable.

However various the obvious causes, they in large part can be reduced to one great primary cause, obstruction of exchange of commodities by some form of artificial restriction. In some sections — notably Southern California — manufacturing development was long paralyzed and the natural margin of profits of farm products devoured by excessive freight charges, imposed without regard to the true cost of the service. In other sections freight discriminations and arbitrary variations at times demoralized prosperity. Some states make manufacturing industries difficult and profitless by laws which make its cost excessive and deter its influx; others restrict by disabling taxation or demagogic labor laws.

The one element common to all these cases is inequality. In every case the product is over-burdened, and thereby placed under a disability in competition with other products not saddled with artificial exactions. In every case those artificial conditions interfere with, or prevent, easy exchange of commodities.

In a word, they prevent reciprocity, the fair exchange of products on a basis of true value and mutual benefit.

I have spoken of these conditions as I have observed and studied them within our own borders. But they reach further, and affect us more deeply. An artificial barrier separates us from Canada, our near neighbor. Canada would be our best customer if we would permit. A large part of that country's products are now of little value to her for lack of a market. We need those products, and could buy them to advantage from Canada if political laws did not prevent their passing the border line. If we bought them Canada

would be rich instead of poor, and would buy most articles in manufactured products from us. The transaction would be of great benefit to both, and would bring great profit not only to our manufacturers, but to our farmers as well. We refuse to buy the manufactures of France and Germany except upon condition that they pay a heavy import duty. A natural resentment leads those nations to refuse to buy those things which we wish to sell. We aim at the prosperity of their manufacturers; they retaliate by aiming at the prosperity of our farmers. Unless we buy their manufactures, many of which we do not ourselves make, they will place an artificial burden upon our farm and manufactured products, which will largely exclude them from those markets, and benefit the food producers of Russia and Lower South America. The worst calamity that can befall this nation is a surplus of farm products, due to the closure of foreign markets to our surplus, and that condition confronts us unless we adopt the policy of reciprocity, the policy of fair exchange on the basis of true value, buying what we can buy more cheaply than we can make.

Reciprocity, in its essence, is equality of exchange, the abolition of the hostile barriers, erected against the incursion of an enemy, and the recognition of a common benefit from an interchange of products, whereby the parties thereto may have the common benefit of the lowest prices upon all the products of either, thus increasing the common prosperity of both.

Although reciprocity, in the economic sense, lies at the root of material prosperity and the true advancement of nations, it has far wider and deeper significance, for it is likewise the dominating principle of moral and political progress, the principle of fair exchange, of mutual benefit, which implies recognition of right as the rule of conduct, and the voluntary abstention from the wrongful exercise of power. All the practical experience, wonderful philosophy and exalted sentiment which that principle embodies, is compacted into one little sentence, that greatest rule of conduct and of Christian practice, "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you!"

This Golden Rule, declared nearly two thousand years ago, has slowly but surely become the standard by which the actions of men and nations are tested, and to which they as a whole conform. "Is it right?" is the demand to which statesmen and peoples must now first of all reply, with no escape from the immutable law which all mankind accepts, that what is not right is not profitable and therefore not expedient, either in morals, government, or economics.

Our forefathers were the first to perceive that the Golden Rule applied no less to political than to moral conditions, to personal rights and control of one's property, no less than to religious conduct. General regard for the rights of others implies the largest degree of individual freedom, liberty and security. The Pilgrim Fathers implanted those principles when they founded this nation; and they are the foundation from whence our national greatness has grown.

Our great prosperity has come from the Golden Rule which our forefathers declared, and which has been inculcated in successive generations of our children. It has shaped our political surroundings, and our morals, and has given every young man in America a chance to become a master. It was the Golden Rule, the principle of reciprocity, that made this country a free nation; for it was when the colonies tried to engage in trade and commerce with other countries, when England insisted that they must trade with her only, that they revolted against unfair exchange and built this nation.

Two years ago at a banquet in New York, the Chinese Minister was a guest. He spoke of the difference between China and the other nations of the world, and said: "What we want is to be left alone with our people. Some two thousand years ago one of our famous men, a prophet, said that what would bring the great nations of the world together is stated in the one word, reciprocity."

I thought very little of that sentiment at the time, and until a few weeks ago at the Charleston Exposition on the New York State day. In visiting among the people of the South, in some of the leading families, they spoke to me about the North, about cotton, and about the period before the war, — how they sold their cotton to England and in return brought home their furniture, their carriages, etc., and from the North only what they needed. I thought then, if there had been reciprocity between the North and South we never should have had a war.

This morning when I heard one of the speakers tell us about Porto Rico it took me back to the tornado which devastated that island a short time ago, when we sent help there. Our representative came back and said that the one great need was reciprocity between that country and the United States. He was ordered to go to Washington and make a report to President McKinley. I remember well the President's remarks, that he would embody in his message to Congress a recommendation that the duty between this country and Porto Rico should be abolished. He did so; the duty was first reduced ten per cent, and later was wholly abolished.

And now Cuba is knocking at our door. For what? For reciprocity. The Cubans want our markets for their products, they want our goods in exchange; and both nations need reciprocity.

If we would maintain the prosperity of this country we must have easy interchange of commerce with all parts of the world. If we want international arbitration, we must stand upon the Golden Rule before all the world, for reciprocity with all nations. We must say to all nations, "We come to meet you half way." Only one thing will serve: that is interchange of commerce. To-day Canada and France and Germany are knocking at our door for reciprocity, and our Congress is doing nothing about it. We are able, by our producing capacity, to command the lion's share of the commerce of the world; but without reciprocity we are threatened with retaliation. If we wish to maintain our great trade with the world, we must have reciprocity; then you will have international arbitration, and not before.

ADDRESS OF MAHLON N. KLINE.

WHAT CAN BUSINESS MEN DO?

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have enjoyed this Convention very much up to this moment, but just now I feel as if we ought to adjourn.

I want to commend not only the hospitality and the courtesy, but the wisdom of our host. When he starts out to plan to consider the question of arbitration he does not arrange for us to do so amid the turmoil and excitement, and possibly occasionally the greed, of business, but he invites us up here to the mountain top, shows us the kingdoms of pretty much all the world. And he doesn't bring us here—and I want you to mark the advance which has been made since the earlier period of time which I have in mind—he doesn't bring us to the mountain top to bring us into temptation to do evil, but he brings us here to tempt us to act righteously and to do that which we ought to do.

I was met, when I came here, by my esteemed friend, Mr. Philip C. Garrett, when I first entered the room, and with a good deal of surprise he said to me, "Well, are you also a convert?" I told him "Not yet;" I had come here at the invitation of Mr. Smiley, and I was going to hear what was to be said, and then I would see. I have heard a great deal; I have learned a great deal. I do not know why I should have hesitated for one moment to announce myself to Mr. Garrett as a convert, because I have been trying in a humble and very imperfect way for a number of years to follow the Prince of Peace. But somehow our religion sometimes gets a little mixed up when we get into practice. The other day I was told about a good old lady who was describing to her friend a very splendid prayer meeting she had been attending, and after speaking of being uplifted and helped, she said, "What do you think! On the way home the street car conductor forgot to collect my fare, and I saved five cents!" Now it seems to me very frequently our practical religion is a little of that order. This Golden Rule which I have heard referred to seems to us on Sunday an excellent thing to follow, but it sometimes happens that before we reach the following Sunday we get that Golden Rule mixed up, and we say: Do unto others as you would be done by—but see that you do the other man first.

I don't know very much about arbitration—I have come here to learn. It is true that most of us who are married have had little domestic difficulties of our own occasionally to settle, and I do not know but that probably that experience prepares us in a way for the larger field of the difficulties that the business man has to settle, and that in turn certainly ought to prepare us for the wider and much more important question of international arbitration. I want to say

that as the result of the great eloquence of the speakers that I have listened to so far, I am a convert.

Now being a convert I presume the question that I ought to ask is, What shall I do? And I believe that is the question that we business men have to answer — What can the business men do to forward this movement? It seems to me that one of the things that we can do is to follow out the very excellent suggestion which was made here yesterday by my friend, Mr. Richardson. Of course, as has been said by other speakers, it is education that is needed. The very confession that I have made to you — that I have known so little about what you gentlemen have for a number of years come together to discuss — shows that there must be many of us busy business men who, although well disposed, have neither the time nor the information to get that which is necessary to bring them to the point of helping in a practical way that which we want to forward. So it seems a good suggestion that the Business Committee shall condense in a very short paper the salient points which the business people of this country ought to know upon this subject; but I am afraid that when these little circulars arrive in the busy offices of busy men, most of them will not be read.

The more effective way, it seems to me, is covered by a suggestion which I saw was made last year at your meeting, — how far it was carried out I do not know, — that the different commercial organizations should somehow or other have brought before them — possibly by some personal representative — the facts on this subject. I believe that if Dr. Trueblood could go from organization to organization, and could get the ear and the attention of business men, many of the things that he said here yesterday would be heeded and would bear fruit.

I hope that from this centre will go out an educational influence which will convince us not only that war is waste, — everyone accepts that as true, — but that will influence us business men to give heed to the admonitions, to the statements and to the arguments which can be made by the leaders — the Business Committee, if you please, — of this organization. I for one am willing to be used to the extent of my abilities in connection with the organization of which I am a member, so as to further amongst our members the spirit which is so beautifully, so cordially, so justly and so ably set forth in the proceedings, — in the speeches, in the remarks and the platform of this organization.

ADDRESS OF OSBORNE HOWES.

TRADE TREATIES AND TRUSTS AS A MEANS OF ALLAYING ANIMOSITIES.

Some fifteen years ago I was thrown for a few hours into intimate association with one of the leading foreign diplomats, and as the result of our friendly discussion, the thought which was left strongest

in my mind was a statement made by him, that now that the dynastic quarrels of the world have come to an end, practically every war that occurs, and for which or against which diplomats have to employ themselves, is due to a trade cause. In his endeavor to enlighten my ignorance and abate possible scepticism on my part he passed over in review a number of the great wars that had occurred, indicating in each of these the trade cause which lay at its base.

The same idea has been still further extended in an article which Mr. Brooks Adams of Massachusetts has recently contributed to one of the magazines, in which he asserts that practically all of the wars which have occurred during the last five hundred or six hundred years have found their cause, in spite of seeming dynastic reasons, in the desire either to protect a trade already possessed or to secure a trade then possessed by some other people.

If in the last analysis wars are based on trade causes, then it seems to me that we must look to trade as the instrumentality by which the end of war can be brought about. Of course the spirit of national competition and pride have to be taken into account, due to causes entirely apart from the buying and selling of goods. Those of you who came here by way of the West Shore Railway must have seen in North River, off the foot of Forty-Second Street, the French battleship which recently arrived here, and with her, as a complimentary consort, an American battleship. Possibly the thought may even have occurred to you which I heard expressed by a small boy when coming over this morning in the ferry boat: "If the two were to have a fight, which would lick the other?" There is unquestionably this belligerent spirit in mankind which Scott has put into the mouth of Marmion, when the latter was looking upon the Scotch army gathered for the invasion of England:

"For, by Saint George, were that host mine,
Not power infernal, nor divine,
Should once to peace my soul incline,
Till I had dimmed their armour's shine
In glorious battle fray!"

But this is nothing more than the spirit of contentious rivalry that exhibits itself, for example, in a game of football between Yale and Harvard universities, and those who are responsible for the government of a civilized country are hardly likely to so far take this into account as to push their country into a war simply for the love of fighting. There must be an underlying cause for these great contentions, and if it is a fact that the self-seeking of nations in the direction of greater trade possessions is the cause, then it is the part of prudence to see whether this cause cannot be so far weakened or turned as to lead to other results.

It is believed by a great many persons, and with not a little reason, that one of the best possible means of reducing these national animosities is through the instrumentality of trade treaties. There is not a shadow of a doubt that the trade treaty which Mr. Cobden succeeded in making with Napoleon Third was a potent instrument in

bringing the English and French people closer together, and laying the ghost of the defeat at Waterloo which for more than a generation had prevented the existence of really amicable relations between the two nations. The Boston Chamber of Commerce has believed that if by any possibility a broad measure of reciprocal trade under the provisions of a trade treaty could be made between the United States and Canada, its existence would go far toward bringing to an end the many other minor differences which now exist between the people of the two countries. If, Mr. Chairman, the Joint High Commission, of which you were a member, had succeeded in giving practical effect to this one article in the protocol, it is the belief of the Boston Chamber of Commerce that the other differences—such as the boundary dispute, the fisheries and fur seal contentions—would have found later on an easy means of adjustment, almost without the need of diplomatic negotiation.

I am inclined to believe that at the present time the most potent cause making for the peace of the civilized world is the development of the unpopular, and in certain ways obnoxious, system of trusts. I think the most peace-making move of the last hundred years has been the formation of the so-called Atlantic Steamship Merger, brought about through the instrumentality of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, this taking in not only a number of American and English lines, but also in its practical effects including the two great German lines of steamers. Judging Mr. Morgan's future actions by his past, it is safe to say that this is only the first step in a long path which will only reach its end when by merger or consolidation practically all of the steamship companies of the world have been brought under one control.

To appreciate what this means it is only necessary to take into account that within the last ten or fifteen years an antagonism has sprung up between Germany and England, and between Germany and the United States, which never before existed. This has been contemporaneous with great extensions of foreign trade on the part of both Germany and the United States. The Germans have desired markets which the English possessed, and have found that the traditional means of securing these has been by aggressive activity; the Germans have also discovered that the aggressive activity of the American people threatens to undermine their growing foreign trade. This has led to a discussion of the question as to whether there is likely to be war between Germany and England, and curiously enough the question of a war between the United States and Germany has been made the subject of song and discussion. And yet such a contest as one between this country and Germany would have seemed, ten or fifteen years ago, ridiculously impossible, as much so as a fight between an elephant and a whale—for the reason that the very conditions of their existence absolutely separated the two.

If this increase in foreign trade, carried on as it generally must be with distant countries, is thus a productive cause of national hostility, then it becomes evident that a great business movement which tends

to denationalize trade, or neutralize its nationality through the centralization of the control of all of the avenues by which commerce travels, must place a decided check on that form of national rivalry which takes the shape of armed aggression. This I firmly believe is what is likely to follow from the development of the recent policy of Mr. Morgan. The doctrine of divine compensation is based on the idea that the evil things of life are to some degree offset by accompanying advantages, and as the establishment of the Roman empire with its despotic form of control made during two or three centuries for the peace of the civilized world, so the organization of a great steamship trust or monopoly, while bringing in its train certain well-defined evils, may tend to bring about as a compensation the almost compulsory reign of universal peace.

ADDRESS OF WARNER VAN NORDEN.

UNWISDOM OF WAR FROM A COMMERCIAL STANDPOINT.

Mr. President: The attitude of the nations toward each other is much like that of a boy sitting on a hobby-horse with his two sisters. Feeling uncomfortably crowded, he said, "If one of us should get down there would be more room for me."

There can be no question as to the unwisdom of war from a commercial standpoint. In whatever way we regard it, war is a great disaster to all business men, to everybody except the few who make money out of it. The rest suffer in purse, in credit and in every possible way. A few contractors may acquire wealth on the principle that

"The rain, it falls upon the just,
And, too, upon the unjust fellows,
But more upon the just, because
The unjust have the just's umbrellas."

We must assume an aggressive position; it is not sufficient to sit still and let the forces of civilization work out for themselves. Hence, it is our duty to teach the people that war is a great horror, and that peace is a great blessing. That may be, perhaps, called a commercial method, but we are living in a commercial age, and we are a commercial people. A man sets up a department store; does he sit still and wait for customers to come? No; he advertises it from morning till night: he exhausts all his ingenuity in informing the people what he has for sale, in making them believe in his policy (which policy is to make money for himself), and by and by success crowns his enterprise.

What occurred in this country in 1896? We were threatened with a great peril; our whole nation seemed to have gone crazy on the silver question, which was a serious menace to our prosperity. Mr. McKinley was nominated, but he was a silver man until the day he was nominated; the leading politicians were silverites until they

thought it was their interest to be otherwise. In this emergency, the business men went to work to educate the people, and they only had four months to do it in. A corporation with which I am connected, having large interests at stake, set up a bureau in its own office. We sent tons and tons of literature to our five thousand agents. Banks and other organizations did the same, and we not only converted many of the dominant party, but a great many of the other party, so that a vast number of Democrats were won over and voted with the Republicans, and the gold standard ticket was elected.

We need to do the same thing in educating the people on the subject of peace and war. A speaker who preceded me to-night confessed that he knew very little about it, although a man of large intelligence and affairs. We must educate. In this twentieth century we cannot afford to stand still. All about us the world is moving. We want to stand in the forefront of a movement so grand as this. We heard this morning some very severe remarks about us Presbyterians, because we glory in the past, and take our creed from the Westminster fathers; but even we Presbyterians are a little more progressive than the committee of deacons who waited upon their new minister declaring that they thought his preaching too progressive. He believed in modern methods, and he wanted an institutional church. In his sermons he overlooked many of the time-honored beliefs, and had as yet said nothing about the eternal future. They continued: "And, sir, we want you to understand that we believe in the doctrine of everlasting punishment, and that the hell that was good enough for our fathers is good enough for us."

The man who is far-sighted leads in his efforts to better his fellow-men, and in business he is the one who makes the millions. We hear a great deal in the present time about anarchism and about social disturbances and the labor problem, and Macaulay said of us, that "Some day we would have among us men who had had no breakfast, and who did not know where they would get their dinner, and unless some Cæsar or Napoleon should arise to seize on the government, our cities would be sacked as was Rome in the fifth century."

Mr. President, there is a great army marching toward us this very hour. Even now we can hear the tramp, tramp, tramp of their onward tread. They are coming to overrun our land, they will take possession of our farms, they will seize upon our workshops, they will take charge of government itself, they will go to Washington and abide in the halls of Congress, confident in their ability to fill the seats of senators. One of them will not hesitate to sit in the chair of our President. They will appropriate our sanctuaries, and preach from our pulpits such doctrines as may seem to them good. Even our homes will not be exempt. The loved firesides where have been wont to gather our dear ones, the sacred seats of father and mother, all must go to the invader. No place will be so secure but they will possess it, no place so holy but they will occupy it. As I speak now, these new-comers are at the gates demanding admittance. Already

we hear the hum of many voices, and the laugh of youthful confidence. We have no alternative but to yield.

This resistless, mighty host is the great army of the children. These children are coming to fill the places of every one of us. They are the ones that are to make up future arbitration conferences; they are the ones that are to wield future power, and they are the ones that you and I ought to be educating to-day to be peace-makers, not war-makers, for the coming time.

Much has been said here of the evil tendency of human nature. While that nature cannot be changed, it is not impossible to make men see things in a new light. When Paul lay that night at Troas listening to the music of the waves as they came rolling in from the Egean Sea, and broke upon the shore, and wondering what might be the meaning of the vision of the man from Macedonia, there was not a single Christian in Europe. And yet, so great was the vital power of Christ's teachings, that within three centuries a recent, foreign and unattractive religion, hated and fought with the utmost fury, had turned the Gardens of Nero into resorts for Christian worship, had had scattered its assemblies over Western Europe, and blazoned the cross on the standards of the empire.

In his eloquent speech this morning, Dr. Herrick Johnson cited the history of the past in support of his position. May we not say that, since the advent of Christ, history is a sort of secondary rubricated scripture, boundless in extent, covering the continents, its initial letters stamped sometimes in gold, sometimes in blood, but the whole, vast, confused and tangled text holding in it still the song of the angels, "Peace on earth, goodwill to men;" the benedictions of the Mount; the story of Bethlehem, Capernaum and Calvary, the illustrious Ascension, and the terrible triumphs of the Apocalypse.

The work begun here is one of the great movements of the age. There are some present who can remember when the anti-slavery movement had no more momentum than has this, which is one of the outgrowths of the religion of Christ, and which is hastening the time when the sword shall be beaten into a ploughshare, and the spear into a pruning hook.

Sometimes one sees in the studio of the artist a marble figure commonly known as a "veiled lady," every characteristic form and feature seen through what seems to be a thin film of lace, but which itself is worked in marble. So the very earth on which we stand is coming to show the face of the Christ, wrought into it from above, and revealed through all the reticulated hardness of its slowly yielding civilization.

At the close of Mr. Van Norden's address, Mr. Sankey, at the request of Mr. A. K. Smiley, sang "The Ninety and Nine." Before singing it, he gave a history of the song and how he came to write it.

REMARKS OF GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY.

UNRELIABILITY OF THE COMMERCIAL FORCES WORKING ALONE.

I am not quite sure but that after the discussion we have had the Conference might now adjourn *sine die*, leaving Mr. Morgan and a few other business men to finish the work that we have at heart.

It is a very large subject that we are considering this evening, scarcely to be covered in twenty minutes, much less in ten or five, but if we can perhaps get into our minds somewhat clearly the aim of the industrial, commercial and financial bodies, we possibly shall have some question as to whether the arbitration work that might result from their influence would be permanent.

The purpose of all industrial organizations is, of course, to secure a larger accumulation of some of the products of the industrial world; that is a purpose which in the present stage, at any rate, of commercial development is essentially selfish, perhaps not unwise for the present time. That being the case, I doubt whether for a long period of time we can rely on the unification of larger aggregations of these individuals seeking for their own selfish advantage to bring about a steady tide towards arbitration on so large a scale as to involve and compel all the nations of the world. I think it very questionable.

We recall, perhaps, many of us, that the commercial interests of the Southern States and of the Northern States were very closely intertwined before the war. I do not myself have much knowledge of the commerce of that time, but I recall hearing of the loud protests, of the widespread protests, that the mercantile interests of the North, and some of those of the South, made against the proposal of war, and how much feeling there was extended through the pulpits, being influenced, apparently, more from the pew than perhaps they ought to have been. We see there, I think, an instance of the fact that when the people are moved by a great moral passion, the commercial interests, selfish as they are, cannot stand against it.

I doubt whether in the sphere of the larger commercial aggregations that we now see evolving at a very rapid pace, there will not come about some kind of revolution, and I doubt whether we can rely upon the outcome of this revolution to support the cause of international arbitration and peace.

It is possible that in the years to come there will be a wiser and saner development of commercial interests, that the efforts of men and women will be to produce the largest quantity possible with the least exertion that is necessary, and that then the purpose will not be to gain the largest aggregation, and that there will be less of the greed of competition. When that time comes, and the commercial, financial and industrial interests are governed by a higher law, perhaps then we may have from this source a larger accession of real reinforcements to our cause. But I doubt whether we can do more

ourselves at the present time than endeavor to educate these great bodies of men, and the younger people who shall succeed them, to realize that the things that finally govern in the world are not the elements of greed and cupidity.

Until we shall see the great influence which these aggregations of capital wield, exercised to reduce the enormous taxation which is borne so gladly, and so enthusiastically even, for the putting of the product of human energy into warships and into guns and forts, we need not have very much confidence in the firmness of the foundation of international arbitration laid through these interests. Only so far as we can educate them to see the loss coming to them from these great armaments that they are now so very enthusiastic about, shall we have any real ground of hope.

Therefore, I come back to the thought which impressed me last night in regard to the many hopeful aspects of the subject. We see progress, we see movement, but the movement may well stop just beyond where we are, unless the great forces that make men hot with a righteous passion for these things are set to work. When we come to a broader and deeper understanding of the fact that all that we really have here is to bring out what each one of us may possess to contribute to the development of a larger manhood and womanhood of the world, when we come to lay emphasis continually upon that, when this Conference is the gathering together of men and women from all over the country who will go back and be centres of influence in this direction, when we declare that there shall not be war, because we are men and women and because others are men and women, — when that time comes and not until that time comes, I believe, shall we have a firm hope for the permanent establishment of international arbitration.

REMARKS OF J. EDWARD SIMMONS.

I came to this Conference to hear, not to be heard. I have declined all invitations to speak, because I am not properly prepared to address this assembly of intellectual men and women on the interesting subject which has been so ably discussed during the past two days. Surely under such conditions I would not presume to take up one second of your time did I not fear that a further refusal to respond to the demand that is made upon me might be regarded as an ungracious recognition of the delightful hospitality which Mr. Smiley has so generously extended to us all. I have enjoyed every moment of my visit at this comfortable hotel, located in the midst of scenery of surpassing beauty, surrounded by shady walks and smooth roads planned with marvelous engineering skill. This peaceful environment ought certainly to drive from the heart and mind of every one of us all arguments in favor of the arbitrament of the sword.

“Peace is tinkling on the shepherd’s bell
And singing with the reapers.”

Therefore, let us not say with Virgil, "Arms I sing," but "Peace I sing."

The gentleman from Boston who represents with so much ability his Chamber of Commerce, has very gracefully spoken some of the thoughts that have come to my mind. I have but one idea to suggest, and that is not new, but only a reiteration of what has already been said. The heart of this subject of international arbitration is, in my opinion, education. I think it has been clearly demonstrated that the more intelligent the people are, the less inclination there is among them to fight. The whole world is better educated to-day than it ever was, and consequently wars are less frequent than they used to be. The percentage of illiteracy has a downward tendency, and as intelligence increases brutality decreases. The world does not appear to be as large as it was fifty years ago. Ocean telegraphy has brought the civilized nations of the earth in such close contact that they can hold daily converse if so disposed. We are getting better acquainted with each other because of inter-trade relationship, and as the United States, this country of freedom and of free schools, seems during the past five years to have taken the lead in industrial and scientific development, largely due to the intelligence of the people, so will it set the pace in its progressive march toward the total abolishment of the arbitrament of the sword and substitute therefor the peaceful methods of international arbitration.

This conference has been most instructive to me. I have enjoyed more than I can express the comprehensive and intelligent character of the various addresses that have been made, and in closing my brief remarks, permit me to assure you that I say Amen to every argument that has been advanced in the advocacy of peace.

The Conference then adjourned.

Fifth Session.

Friday Morning, May 30, 1902.

The Conference met at ten o'clock.

The Chairman of the Business Committee announced that the President of the Conference had, at the request of the Committee, consented to deliver an address upon the Pan-American Congress held during the past year in the City of Mexico.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN W. FOSTER.

THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT MEXICO CITY.

MR. FOSTER : I have had some experience with the Business Committee, and have formed a very high opinion of their executive ability and good judgment, but this morning I am inclined to doubt it. In the first place they tell us that there are a large number from whom they would be glad to hear, but they have not the time, and now they have been hearing from me in and out of season for two days and yet they force me to come before you again. I am asked to speak upon the subject of the Pan-American Congress which assembled in the City of Mexico last winter.

It is hardly necessary for me to give a history of this Congress. Its first session was held in Washington twelve years ago under the auspices of Mr. Blaine as Secretary of State, who had a great deal to do in shaping its action. That Congress adopted a number of resolves and projects. I am sorry to say all of them came to naught. I am hardly justified in saying that. None of them were ripened into practical results except one, that was the establishment of a Bureau in Washington for the dissemination of information respecting the American States. That Bureau has been maintained from that time to this, but all the other projects failed to be carried into effect, mainly because they required the final action of the Executive and the Congress of each State, and no general action was had, possibly for want of some special supervision. The recent Congress has sought to avoid that by providing for a permanent executive committee, whose business it will be to follow up its recommendations and also to convoke another Congress within five years unless they should deem it wise to postpone it. So we may hope that the results of the last Congress will bear greater fruit because of this system which has been provided for following up the recommendations with an effort to have them carried into effect.

It is proper that I should first speak of the place where the meeting was called, because it has peculiar significance. It was held in the City of Mexico, the capital of the second republic on this hemisphere—the second republic in many ways—in population, in resources, and in intelligent advance in government. The invitation was issued by the President of Mexico to the United States and the other American Republics. It was a proper place to hold the convention, because there was presented a good object lesson. We are familiar with the history of the Spanish-American Republics, and we know that it is one general history of revolution and disorder and bloodshed. Mexico was able to present to them a record during the past twenty-five years of unbroken peace and order, and as a result, of prosperity. It was well for the Spanish-American Republics to go to Mexico to see what peace and a continuity of government will accomplish. And what has it accomplished in Mexico? It has given them peace, good order, security to persons and property. I visited Mexico last year, and I spent several years in Mexico more than twenty years ago, so that I was able to make a contrast. There is in Mexico as much peace, good order, security to persons and property as exists in any republic or government of this hemisphere. That was something for these other States to see and profit by. They saw a government established, with the development of all the resources, like the good railway system that has been built up in Mexico in this reign of peace for the last twenty years. They have increased three-fold their exports and imports; they have established a financial credit greater than that of any other of the Spanish-American Republics. That is the result of peace, for without it they could not have established that credit. I could go on and enumerate many other of the benefits of peace which the meeting in Mexico afforded as an object lesson to these countries.

What were some of the results of that Congress? It was resolved that steps should be taken for the establishment of a uniform system of customs regulations for the import and export of goods, mainly for import, and for the regulation of shipping in harbors. The business men present who have any relations with foreign countries will know how important it is to agree upon some uniform system of customs regulations for the transaction of business.

Another important step taken was to establish a uniform system of sanitary regulations, a quarantine system for the protection of health, and at the same time not to throw any unnecessary hardship upon the transaction of business between the different countries. There are conferences to be held this year by committees of the Congress designated to discuss this question.

There was also a project for an inter-continental railway system—a scheme somewhat visionary, I think; but it is well enough to encourage the idea of inter-communication.

Also it was provided that a commission should be appointed to meet and frame a code of international law especially applicable to the American States. It would be a great step in the direction of

peace if these nations could agree upon what are the principles of international law that should govern them. It has been well said in this Conference that international law is no law at all because there is no power to enforce it, but if we can establish by the concurrence of these nations what are the principles of international law that should govern these American States, there will then be a law — a law which will have the binding force of the pledge and sentiment of these nations to guarantee its observance. It would be especially useful in the matter of claims. Claims are a source of a great deal of controversy between States, and if an agreement could be had upon the principles which should govern the adjustment of claims alone, it would be an important step in the direction of peace and comity between the nations.

A number of other minor matters were approved, but it is not necessary for me to dwell upon them. The important action was in regard to arbitration. That has been very fully recited by Dr. Trueblood, and I do not think that it is necessary for me to repeat it. However, probably some of you were not present when Dr. Trueblood told us about this, and it is well to fix in our minds just what was done, without any elaboration on my part.

All the nations assembled in Mexico agreed unanimously upon a treaty for the submission of all claims to arbitration. They agreed unanimously that all the nations which were not then parties to the Hague Convention, — the only two parties to it now being the United States and Mexico, — that all the other nations of the American hemisphere should adhere to or become parties to the Hague Convention of Arbitration. Ten of the States, or a majority of them, agreed among themselves upon a treaty of obligatory arbitration as between themselves, binding them to submit all questions (excepting those relating to independence and national honor) to arbitration, and they very strictly defined what were the questions of independence and national honor.

Now all these matters are yet to be perfected by the approval of the Executive of each State and the ratification by the Congress of each State. No one of these matters can be carried into effect without that process. We readily understand that no delegates from the United States can go down to Mexico and make a law, or join in a treaty, that will be obligatory upon the United States, until the President first approves and sends it to the Senate of the United States and secures its ratification. And the system of government in all these republics in this respect is the same. So these resolves are only in an inchoate stage, but we hope that all of them will be realized. However, if only some of them are realized we will have made progress, and in five years these States will come together in another Congress, in a place yet to be designated, and they will then review the work that has been accomplished, which of these projects have been carried into effect, which of them have failed, and why they have failed. It will then be considered whether it is possible

to overcome the obstacles and make these projects a success in the future.

So that I think the meeting of these delegates in the City of Mexico was very profitable and very successful. It is a great thing for men who have conflicting business interests to come together and talk them over; they generally advance a step, even if they do not make an agreement. It is a greater thing for the representatives of nations to come together and consider the things which make for peace, and the means of removing the difficulties that exist between them. Therefore if nothing else is accomplished but the holding of this Conference, it is a great step. But it has accomplished a great deal, and I think the results will be shown within the next five years.

I will now be glad to answer any questions on this particular subject.

QUESTION: Where can the proceedings of this Pan-American Congress be found? Has anything been published?

MR. FOSTER: I can't say. There have been a number of separate publications relating to the proceedings. They will be published, but will make quite a series of volumes, for the report of the proceedings held in Washington twelve years ago was quite voluminous. However, the Bureau of American Republics in Washington publishes a monthly serial giving information respecting it, and it will send it to any person who is interested enough to send a request to that effect.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: What is the prospect of the ratification of these three arbitration conventions, and how long do you think it will be before they are ratified, and what shall we do to help to get them ratified?

MR. FOSTER: I am afraid it will be a long time before they are all ratified. We can help most effectually to get them ratified by inducing our own government to set the example. I have an impression that there will be some serious opposition to the United States pledging itself to submit every claim of an American citizen, without regard to its character, to the Hague tribunal. Suppose a man has a claim for fifty thousand dollars for property taken unjustly in Mexico. I do not think there would be much left after paying the expenses of prosecution before the tribunal at The Hague. In other words, it would not pay to send a small claim over to the Hague tribunal.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: Cannot a number of these claims be settled by ordinary diplomatic methods?

MR. FOSTER: Yes. An American had a claim against the Republic of Salvador. That is a poor Republic, and yet it recently agreed with the government of the United States to submit the claim to the judgment of three people — one, a gentleman from

Salvador, another, one of our distinguished public men, Don M. Dickinson of Detroit, and the third the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. The judges have just made their decision. I am sorry to say it was received very unkindly by the Republic of Salvador, because judgment was given for the American citizen for the full amount of his claim, and Salvador is a poor country and it will be a heavy burden to pay the amount. But it will be paid; the Latin Republics are poor but they always strive to live up to their national obligations and treaties.

Take the case of Mexico and the United States. They made a treaty for the adjustment of all claims of the one country against the other, and the result of the deliberations of the Commission, which met twenty-five years ago, was to show a balance against Mexico of four millions of dollars. I was Minister to Mexico at the time the first payment became due, and they had to pay three hundred thousand dollars. It was just after President Diaz had come into power. There was no money in the treasury, so he borrowed the amount from the merchants and paid one per cent. a month for it, in order that the government of Mexico might meet its obligation to the United States. And although they claimed that a number of the awards were based upon fraud and perjury yet they paid them all. But afterwards the government of the United States became satisfied that some of the claims were fraudulent, and it returned the money received for those claims back to the government of Mexico in full.

MR. BENEDICT: I understood you to say that there had been a protocol adopted at the City of Mexico for the settlement of claims. Is that separate from the Convention of Arbitration?

MR. FOSTER: Yes. All the nations represented there have agreed to refer all questions of claims to the Hague tribunal. Now the distinction between that and the other action in regard to the Hague tribunal is that they have agreed to become parties to the Hague Conventions, and to become parties to the Hague Arbitration Convention does not bind them to arbitration in all questions. It is simply an expression of opinion that arbitration is a desirable means of adjusting international differences. But if their action at the City of Mexico is ratified they will be bound to submit all cases of claims to the Hague tribunal.

MR. FORBES: I would like to ask a question in regard to the Chile-Argentine agreement which has been made and which appears in this morning's paper? What relation has that to the Hague Convention?

MR. FOSTER: I have not seen the item of news referred to. I saw, a day or two ago, that Chile and Argentina had agreed upon a treaty by which they agree to disarmament and to submit all their questions to arbitration. This means that those two countries have

agreed upon obligatory arbitration as between themselves. In becoming parties to the Hague Convention they agree that arbitration is a good thing generally, but now they have made a treaty that as between themselves they must arbitrate their differences.

DR. MAINS: It would be a matter of interest to me if the speaker, with his large experience in diplomatic affairs, would say to us what he thinks may be the grounds of probability of the Hague tribunal becoming early, in fact, an international court; or, if he thinks there are insurmountable obstacles, will he state them?

MR. FOSTER: When two great nations agree to submit some important question to the Hague tribunal for arbitration a great step will be taken toward the realization of our hopes. Mexico and the United States have just agreed, as has been announced, to submit a matter of a claim to that tribunal, but usually nations do not go to war about claims; one day's war would cost more than the whole of that claim. So that it is a small thing for governments to submit claims to that tribunal. But, speaking only for illustration, if Russia and Japan could agree to submit to the arbitration of a court to be selected from the Hague tribunal the question of their relations to Korea, so that they would be bound by that decision, it would have a great influence on other nations. Secretary Hay, when they were wrangling over the question of the indemnity that each nation should exact from China, proposed that the whole question should be referred to the Hague tribunal. That was a money question, it is true, but it involved hundreds of millions of dollars. If France and Russia and Germany, who were piling up enormous claims, had agreed to submit that matter to the judgment of the Hague tribunal, it would have been a great step toward the realization of our hopes. Until two great nations submit some important question to the Hague tribunal, it will be an untried experiment.

MR. GIBSON: There seems to be a doubt whether, where the integrity of a nation is involved, such a question should be submitted to arbitration. Now as I understand it such a question did exist between Chile and Peru, and I should like to know what settlement was made of it.

MR. FOSTER: None; for the very reason that it was so difficult to bring the governments to agree to settle it by arbitration.

I had the honor of delivering an address before the National Geographical Society of Washington on "The New Mexico," and if any of you think it is worth your while to read it, if you will send me a letter asking for a copy I will mail it to you.

HON. C. C. NOTT, Chief Justice of the Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., was next introduced.

ADDRESS OF HON. C. C. NOTT.

CERTAINTY THAT THE HAGUE TRIBUNAL WILL BE USED.

What is arbitration? It is simply a means or process for adjusting international differences. Whether arbitration will control the wickedness of human nature and the lust of conquest; whether it will rule future men of blood and iron; whether it will meet the conditions of all cases that are brought before it; whether nations who enter into arbitration will repudiate their obligations—these are matters which are no concern of mine. It is enough for me as a practical man to say that arbitration is the only means which the human mind has yet devised for settling international obligations, and that it is my duty as a practical man to give it my support without raising querulous questions as to its sufficiency.

The remarks which I am about to make are exceedingly unpalatable to me for the reason that they involve the personal element. Yet I make the sacrifice because what I am about to say is not oratory, but testimony, and it is testimony to the wisdom of that ideal which has dominated the action of Mr. Smiley and our own proceedings.

It so happened that during the last autumn, Mr. Barrett, one of the delegates to the Pan-American Congress, finding that I had been of all living men longest upon the bench of the Court of Claims dealing with obligations of governments, wrote to me requesting that I would sketch a form for a court of claims of an international character, and he subsequently submitted to me for my criticism the schemes and plans of some of the other Republics. When I got to work upon this business it soon became plain to me that what Mr. Barrett wanted, without knowing it, was really a court of arbitration under the name of a court of international claims; and it then became clear to me that there has been sitting for fifteen or twenty years within your own gates an international tribunal in effect, though not in name, dealing with international obligations,—a court of arbitration.

To make this matter plainer I will illustrate. Congress has sent to the Court of Claims the French spoliation cases, cases which arose at the end of the eighteenth century, which are more than a hundred years old. Those claims involve the honor of France, the legal, though not the nominal, defendant at the bar of the court; and the question which arises in every case is, Is France liable? Very important, too, are some of the cases which have come before the court in that jurisdiction, cases of peace and war. You must remember that there was a short naval war between France and ourselves, which did not extend beyond the confines of the West Indies, but which nevertheless was war whenever two naval vessels met. The "Constellation" lost in two hours more men than the American navy lost in the entire Spanish-American War.

Very curious are some of the individual cases. During this month of May has appeared at the bar of the court a slaver in the person of his great-grandchildren, claiming from France indemnity for his slaves captured in 1795. France, in the person of the Attorney-General of the United States, has replied that she was not liable; that this importation of slaves was prohibited by the laws of the United States. And the slaver has replied that France cannot be rid of her international obligations because of any local municipal law; and the Attorney-General has replied to that, that while it is true that in an abstract case slaves were property and might be recovered according to international law at that time, yet, nevertheless, it did not become the United States to allow her own citizens to press a claim which, according to American law, was illegal. The case has not yet been decided, and I am sorry to say that I cannot allay the reasonable curiosity of the ladies by telling them what the result will be. Again, there have been international cases of the civilized Indian nations. It was the Indian nations who took the initiative and first proposed to carry their differences with the United States to this tribunal of the United States—they were the movers in the direction of peace.

There has also been a still more curious class of cases; that is, cases of the Indian nations against each other. In such cases the court has been sitting, in the strict sense of the term, as an impartial international tribunal. The Indians, such as the Choctaws, the Cherokees, the Chicasaws, have appeared by their own lawyers, and have submitted without disapproval to the arbitrament of the court.

There has also been a frightful mass of cases which are not in form, but in effect, international, a mass steeped in blood from its surface to its centre—I mean the atrocities of white men against Indians and of Indians against white men for the last fifty years. These are cases which bring up the obligations of treaties and the rights of belligerents and all the questions of international law, and they have brought up some of the most involved questions which can possibly come before an international tribunal.

It has been asked whether great cases, and cases involving boundaries and national honor, would be submitted to a tribunal. The national honor of France has been before the court for ten years, and I am happy and proud to say that the latest French work upon international law has quoted the decisions of the court as high and unquestionable authority, and has incorporated the decisions into its pages.

In some of these cases millions of dollars have been involved. In the case of the Choctaw nation against the United States more than eight million dollars was claimed, and the final award was for more than three million dollars. In one notable case of the Choctaws and the Five Affiliated Bands, as they are called, there was a tract of land nearly as large as Belgium in dispute. When these disputes have come in the sober form of lawsuits little has been said about them; the machinery has worked just as the machinery which adjusts

the other differences of men has worked, and no one has thought anything about it.

I now come to the practical part of what I wish to say. There is a trait in human nature, an element which modern scientists would formulate and call a law. It is, that men in authority have an innate dislike to parting with power and an invincible repugnance to conferring power upon the unknown. The formation of the Court of Claims was not brought about until three members of Congress were ignominiously expelled for bribery and corruption in connection with private claims. Even then it was so limited in its powers as to be practically useless. When the bill to establish it was before the Senate, Stephen A. Douglas said, "I am not satisfied with this bill; I want a court whose decisions shall bind *us*." But the counsels of the weak and the timid prevailed, and no such court was then established. It required ten years of failure on the part of the court, and it required the immense impending avalanche of the litigation of the Civil War, to wring from Congress a re-organization and enlargement of the court and to confer upon it the power of rendering decisions which should bind even Congress.

When that had been done, when the work of the court had gone on, when the judges had become known at least by name, when it was perceived that what went on in this court was simply judicial work, that there was the ordinary legal organization, that there was the ordinary judicial construction, that cases were decided according to law, that law ruled about as much in the court as arithmetic does in the counting-house,—then the tide turned. Then Congress began to unload upon this unfortunate, already overburdened court every difficult thing with which they themselves could not conveniently cope. There came the claims (some \$16,000,000) of the District of Columbia; there came these frightful Indian depredation cases; there came these French spoliation cases; there came case after case involving immense amounts of money. The Hot Springs of Arkansas cases involved the title of an entire town, of every hotel and house and church and even the street railways. There had been litigation for thirty-two years, Congress had been besieged for twenty years, yet in two years the court rendered a judgment in favor of the United States, and the thing established was accepted without the slightest hesitation.

All the early litigation of the Union Pacific Railways came there in the same manner. In some cases the railway recovered against the United States, and in some cases the United States recovered against the railway. The largest money judgment ever rendered by the court was for over four million dollars in favor of the United States against the Central Pacific Road.

Now with this experience which I am able to bring to bear on the issue of arbitration, I have no hesitation in deducing from it as my own conclusion, that if you can ever establish an international tribunal in the nature of a court, and if that international tribunal shall have its doors open at all times, the nations of the earth for the most

part will gladly go into it with their international differences. I do not believe in obligatory treaties. I agree with General Foster that it is very doubtful whether those treaties will ever be ratified. I know full well that men in authority will not confer power upon the unknown. There must be something established; they must see it working; they must concur in what it will probably do, and then they will willingly use it as their instrument.

Consequently, so believing, so thinking and so far as my experience goes so knowing, I hail the Hague tribunal as the greatest advance in the cause of peace that has ever occurred in this troubled world; and I hail as the greatest step that has been taken, the greatest advance that has been made, the most important thing that has occurred during the last year, the fact that two nations of the earth have gone to the Hague tribunal with their differences. Once let the tide turn in that direction and the current will flow ceaselessly. Mankind is not belligerent; there is in every nation combustible material, but the great, peaceful mass whom President Eliot has well called the "unknown millions," the men who work for their families without ambition, and lay up money to bring their children up decently—the farmers of this country, the artisans of this country, the well-to-do laborers of this country—they want no war, they need no converting.

THE CHAIRMAN: New York State has many things to be proud of, but nothing to be more proud of than its great court. We in other States have learned to pattern after and to admire the court of the State of New York, the Court of Appeals, and I am glad to know that we are now going to hear from a representative of that court, the Hon. Judson S. Landon.

ADDRESS OF HON. JUDSON S. LANDON.

Ladies and Gentlemen: This is the first session of this Conference that I have attended. I have been sitting here as a learner, and I am not going to try to teach my teachers. I find that I am in sympathy with this work and in sympathy with most of the measures which have been suggested as having a tendency to promote it.

I am glad to note the increasing confidence which has been expressed here in the final triumph of arbitration. You invite to your aid all kinds of means—schools, colleges, the press, and the church.

It has been objected that you lack the coercive power which is necessary to give authority and execution to the orders of a mere court of arbitration behind which stands no army and no State. You answer that objection by saying that you propose to educate public opinion, and then to rely upon its coercive power. It seemed to me at first that that was an unstable reliance; that when the supreme test should come very likely it would fail. But after hearing

others express their confidence in it I have been gradually drawn over to their side, and I want to confess that I have been a sort of a dreamer of dreams as I have been sitting here and listening to these debates. And I am going to suggest to you something of the character of one of my dreams.

This is a Conference held under the invitation of our good host, and we assume so long as his benevolent, patriotic, Napoleonic brain shall dominate, we need not fear. But I am prompted to ask the question, Why not convert the Conference into a stable Association? I dare say you have thought of it. Why not incorporate? Why not ask Mr. Smiley to name the incorporators? Why not give to this Conference a legal, a physical, an eternal existence so far as a corporate existence is eternal? Why not give it the power to charter branch associations, coöperative associations, here and there in every city or town or place in the Union where two or three or more may be gathered together and may be anxious and willing to lend their assistance to promote the supreme objects of this Association? Why not make it the parent Association? Why not dream with me that in the future, when peace shall prevail throughout the world, the devotees of peace shall look to Mount Mohonk as the Mecca of Peace? Why not make the Mohonk Association, then, this parent society, spreading gradually throughout the world, inviting to coöperate with it every Chamber of Commerce, every Board of Trade, every religious association, every educational institution, and finally ask (and I think you might ask) every political society to declare in effect that war is the relic of barbarism, and that the day has gone by when any honorable nation can resort to war without having first exhausted every resource of peace?

Would any political organization, after you had permeated society and public sentiment with your own opinion, refuse to pass such a resolution? Would it not be wise to have every Chamber of Commerce, and every other association which I have named, appoint a committee or an agent who should coöperate with your society and make that other society a consulting member of your Association? And then, assuming that my dream should come true, let your incorporation give you the power to unite with other like bodies in other continents, so that the Mohonk Association should possibly, in the end, become a member of every Peace Society with which it thought it wise to affiliate in every peace-loving country of the world.

And then, perhaps, through the influence of these affiliated societies, of which this would be the parent society, you would girdle the earth, and thus you would mold that public opinion. For who is opposed to you? Nobody; you have the field alone, and the harvest is waiting for you. There is no party opposed to you, there will be none; it simply requires that you shall so organize your efforts, that you shall so enlist the coöperative energy and activity of every person and society and country, or part of a country, with you as to enable you to bring the public sentiment of the world to declare that war shall be no more.

Now these suggestions of mine may be visionary and may be impotent, but one has the right to ask foolish questions in the hope that his own folly may suggest wise questions to others. It is in that spirit that I have ventured to be somewhat officious in this matter, in the hope that although I may have given no plan worthy of your consideration, I may have suggested enough to lead you to think of further means toward the promotion of what you so much desire.

MR. A. K. SMILEY: I want to say one word which I think you will appreciate. This thought has come into our minds many times and many people have suggested it, but I think I can show in a minute that it cannot be carried out. If such a plan had been carried out two years ago our last two speakers would not have been here; we should not have had room for them because all those who were here two years ago would be here now. It would be impossible to get new men here if we should establish a permanent organization. We maintain a permanent Secretary at an expense of nearly two thousand dollars a year, and we control him. It might seem a good thing to incorporate a society, but it cannot be done.

The Chairman then introduced Clinton Rogers Woodruff of Philadelphia, who spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF.

PROGRESS THROUGH INDIVIDUAL EFFORT.

I am sure that the solution of the Mohonk problem so called, which has been referred to both this year and last, grows out of the desire of everyone who has been honored with an invitation to partake of the delightful hospitality of Mr. Smiley, to have perennial spring and continuous conferences, one each week, so that each part of the country may come under the influence of Mohonk. Next to this is to have these annual meetings which of themselves demonstrate the progress of the thought and cause of international arbitration.

I am sure we were all impressed with the meeting last evening. I have said to several this morning that I doubted very much whether a meeting like that would have been possible three or four years ago. To think of it, — that we should have eight prominent, active, aggressive business men, whose names are known throughout the length and breadth of this land as business men, to come here and pay the tribute which they did to the cause of arbitration and to argue that arbitration is a practical thing, that arbitration is necessary, that we must have arbitration if we are to have the highest ideals which we are seeking for.

I have been thinking very much of a quotation which illustrates the thought of the progress of this very Conference from its inception

eight years ago up to the present time. It is from Alfred de Vigny. He says :

“Society is a large clock, having three hands. One advances so slowly that one could believe it motionless. It is the mass of men. Another, somewhat lighter and swifter of motion, progresses rapidly enough to permit the eye, with a little attention, to perceive its progress. This is the mass of enlightened men. But above these two hands is another more agile and whose bounds one follows with much difficulty ; sixty times it has gone the space before it ere the minute hand has progressed, and the first hand has dragged itself thus far. Never, no never, have I looked at this third hand, this little dart, so restless, so bold, so emotional, quivering as it were with a sense of its own audacity, or with the pleasure of its conquest over time—never have I looked at it without thinking that the past has ever had—ever should have this rapid advance march in the centuries, this advance upon the general spirit of the nation,—ever upon that of its most enlightened past.”

And so it has been with this Conference. We remember the idealists, as we call them, Dr. Edward Everett Hale, Mr. Smiley and the others, who represent the second hand of the clock. But we have already progressed, and we find that the mass of enlightened men are taking hold of this question of international arbitration and working it out with great force and with great success. And the time will come, I have no doubt within the very near future, when the great mass of men will believe in international arbitration, and believing in it will insist that it shall prevail at all times and under all circumstances. And then the great object of our meetings will have been accomplished.

I am one of those who, when he believes in a movement, wants to see others believe in it, and wants to put the machinery into operation to bring other people into line with it. I believe that there can be great good done by this Conference not perhaps along the line of Judge Landon's suggestion, but along the lines of individual effort as suggested by Mr. Kline last evening. If every man who is present here to-day and who is connected with a business organization will go back to the business organization and say to his colleagues that this matter of international arbitration is a practical thing, and will ask that business body to take steps to endorse the suggestion, I have no doubt that there will be formed a body of public sentiment of great force and power. If Mr. Howes of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Brown of New York, Mr. King of the Merchants' Association, Mr. Kline of the Trade League of Philadelphia, and so on, were to say to these great bodies that we must enforce international arbitration and that it is of the greatest importance, I have no doubt that there would be a public opinion formed throughout the business circles of this country that would have great force and effect, and that all the other business bodies would fall in line, and we could come together again a year hence and say that the great mass of business men are back of us in insisting upon international arbitration.

And then those of us who may not be connected with such organizations — we can do much in our individual life to help the cause.

I fear that we do not recognize the power of our own individual effort and the great necessity of doing the small things. I cannot express my own thought better than by calling attention to a few words from the speech of our honored President Roosevelt at Arlington in which he says :

“What we need most in this Republic is not special genius, not unusual brilliancy, but the honest and upright adherence on the part of the mass of the citizens and of their representatives to the fundamental laws of private and public morality, which are now what they have been during recorded history, and we shall succeed or fail in making this Republic what it should be made, — I will go a little further than that; what it shall and must be made, — according to the manner in which we seriously and resolutely set ourselves to do the task of citizenship, which consists of doing the duties, private and public, which, in the aggregate, make it up.”

If we individually should go forward in that spirit I am sure that the cause of international arbitration will have taken a great step forward before we meet here again another year.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to say that the greatest influence in this country is the pulpit, but I was afraid some of the newspaper men might criticize me for that. I will say that the greatest moral influence in the country is the pulpit; probably they will not quarrel with me for saying that. And the machinery by which these pulpits are supplied is the theological seminary. So we come to the fountain head of the moral teaching of this country, and are to listen to one of its representatives, Prof. William Adams Brown, of the Union Theological Seminary.

ADDRESS OF REV. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN.

THE TASK OF EDUCATING PUBLIC SENTIMENT DIFFICULT BUT IMPERATIVE.

We have come to the time in the history of this Conference when applications are in order. Mr. Sankey will bear me out when I say that the best kind of a meeting is an inquiry meeting, and the success of any inquiry meeting is to be judged by the extent to which it brings every man and woman in it individually to ask the question: What must I do?

Now we have been having a great inquiry meeting on the subject of international arbitration, and the time has come for us to ask ourselves the question: What can we do to promote this great cause in the interest of which we have been gathered together?

I think the discussions of the last few days have made it very clear that the work which is to be done falls into two classes. There is the direct propaganda of the cause, which must take place in the parliaments and senates, through the means of diplomacy and statesmanship, and through the machinery which can be brought to bear to influence the public men by whom the action of nations is moulded. And for that work we must rely upon the efforts of such men as our

presiding officer and Dr. Trueblood and others ; and the most that the rest of us can do is to know what they are doing, to applaud their success, to supply them with the sinews of war, and to do all that we can to inform our neighbors of the great work upon which they are engaged.

But there is another side of this work which is no less important. It is the creation of the public sentiment upon which these men may rely and to which they can appeal. And that is a work for everyone of us. That cannot be done unless we do our share.

Reference has been made here to the recent happy issue in the Presbyterian Church. I yield to no one in admiration of the skill and wisdom of the committee which brought in the return which was unanimously adopted a few days ago. But it was not the committee alone who revised that creed ; it was the body of earnest men and women throughout the churches who have been making the sentiment which has made this result possible.

The education of public sentiment is our work, and I want to speak about that. There was a time when people thought that education was the easiest thing in the world. When a man could not do anything else they made him a schoolmaster. The chief qualifications for a teacher were, first, poverty, and, secondly, family relationship to a man who was on the school committee. When a minister broke down in health and had to give up his charge, it was the custom to appoint him to the particular chair in the theological seminary which I have the honor to hold. We are learning better ; we are learning that education is a hard business ; that it needs long study and practice ; that we must know the child or the man whom we would teach—his nature, his sympathies, his temptations. It is not enough simply to repress ; we must utilize the forces which are in him and which are working upon him ; curiosity, the social instinct, the very restlessness, the animal restlessness which is the bane of a teacher when it is not properly used—these must be enlisted in our aid. The foreign missionaries are learning this lesson ; they are learning that they must tell the story of the Cross so that it can be understood, and they count no labor too great, no patience too long, that will help them to enter into the life of the men and women to whom they come, to understand their history and their temptations, and so to utilize whatever good they find in existence in order to make their message more effective for their uplifting.

So it must be in this great cause upon which we are engaged. We are trying to eradicate war—war which goes back to the infancy of our race, which has its roots struck deep in the soil of our human nature. And if we are to defeat this enemy of ours we must understand it. Granting—what I suppose most men in this Conference believe—that war in itself is evil, and only evil, it is a fact that it has enlisted the interest and the enthusiasm of some of the best of men ; that upon its soil some of the fairest flowers of our humanity have bloomed. Dr. Strong told us the other day that war was one of the means through which man gratified his desire for justice, and

if we would obliterate war we must show men that justice could be had by international arbitration more speedily and effectually. And that is true.

But I do not think this is the most obvious side of the matter, or the most dangerous. It is not so much justice which appeals to men in regard to war; it is the heroism of war. It is the appeal to that which is manly; to courage, to devotion, to endurance, to self-sacrifice. If we would obliterate this evil we must show men that the soil for which we plead can grow these same flowers better. We must bring men to see the heroism of peace, and for that we must have great causes with which to appeal to the men and women to whom we speak. Preaching will not do it; there must be example. We must show that there are men and women to-day who are exemplifying every one of these great virtues in the common walks of life.

There is one cause among the many for encouragement to which I do not think due reference has yet been made in this Conference, that is, the multiplication in this day of ours of the avenues of human service. There never was a day in the history of the race when so many men and women were engaged intelligently, loyally, and uncompromisingly in the great cause of serving men. We should seek to magnify, in the eyes of all those whom we can influence, the glory and the dignity of this work. The work of social reform, of good city government, the efforts to improve the care of our criminal class and to secure better housing for our poor, our settlement work, the work of education in the large sense, as well as the missionary work, technically so called, — all these are creating a type of men and women upon whom our propaganda must rest and through whom alone it can be carried to success.

It all comes back at last to the simple question of making earnest with our Christianity.

Two years ago from this platform Dr. Felix Adler, a man whom all who love truth, righteousness and justice delight to honor, asked the question why it is that the churches, servants of the Prince of Peace, should have had so little influence in these nineteen centuries to stay the passions of war. If I might venture to suggest an answer, speaking for myself as a Christian minister, I would say: It is because we have made too little of the heroic in Christianity. It is because we have made our gospel too easy and have pitched our preaching too low; it is because we have not claimed for our Master the whole of that which is good in human nature all along the line; that our people are swept off their feet by the specious cries of a heroism which is less great than that which should be theirs.

One word more. When we go back home to take up our work, whatever it may be, it is not enough for us simply to try to put more loyalty and enthusiasm into it. It must be our study to come to know better and to be knit more closely to all those men and women everywhere who are engaged in these great causes to which I have

referred. This matter of international arbitration which has brought us together is not an isolated thing. It is linked to every good cause everywhere; it is a part of the upward movement of our common humanity.

Five days ago I stood at Greensboro, N. C., looking out over a beautiful park which belongs to the State Normal College, and the Principal said to me, "This is my Memorial Park; here I propose to erect monuments to the great men and women who have labored in the cause of education, and no one who is merely a soldier or a politician shall have a place in this park. I want to teach my teachers to honor the heroes of peace as well as the heroes of war." Was not that to work for international arbitration?

So it is with everyone, wherever he may be, who is laboring in the spirit of Christ for the uplifting of humanity. Whether he knows it or not, he is a worker in our cause. Link enough men and women by this chain and our problem is solved.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have now reached a point where everyone has an opportunity to make a five-minute speech. The meeting is now open for general discussion.

REV. JOSEPH NEWTON HALLOCK: Those of us who have attended many of these Conferences have come more and more to feel that humanitarianism is itself becoming one of the most potent forces in the cause of international arbitration. The wars we have witnessed during the past few years have proved great object lessons, and are doing more, perhaps, than anything else to hasten the time of universal peace. Take, for instance, the South African War, happily, as we believe, just closing, and what an object lesson we have before us! Without entering on the merits of either side, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that each professes to be a Christian nation and to be governed by the commands of the Prince of Peace. Yet, so persistently have the Boers continued to fight for their rights, as they believe, that the world stands aghast at the awful expenditure in blood and treasure.

Now, suppose that, instead of a small handful of men on one side, there had been a great empire on either side. What must have been the result? According to the logic of war, neither side would have yielded till both sides were wiped off the face of the earth. Their differences would have been arbitrated much after the manner of the celebrated Kilkenny cats. You remember the case!

With such object lessons before us, our business committee have wisely declared that there are limitations to our discussion. Some have taken exception to this, and say that we are all optimists, and that it is a discussion in which but one side can be heard. That in a measure is true. The time has passed when there is any need to discuss this matter *per se*. We no longer doubt that arbitration is the right way to settle a dispute, be that dispute between individuals or between nations. We would as soon think of rising at this day

in a temperance meeting and discussing whether temperance is right. We are all perfectly satisfied that arbitration is right, and this Conference is to devise the best ways and means for forwarding the movement. We have no room for pessimists here.

I wish I had time to state more fully the reason why we are nearly all optimists in this cause of arbitration. It is a long time since "Peace on earth and goodwill to men" was sung by the angels who were hovering over the shepherds, as they watched their flocks by night, nineteen hundred years ago. It is a long time to wait for the fulfillment of that message of peace and goodwill to men. But the time is surely coming when men shall "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks," and the earth shall be blessed with the joy and righteousness that follow justice and truth. The old Roman motto was "*Magna est veritas, et praevalerebit*," — truth is mighty and will prevail. And we have this full confidence in our cause because it is founded on the eternal rock of truth. We may not succeed at once, or even in the near future, but succeed we shall, and all in God's good time.

HON. HENRY B. METCALF: I suppose many of us would enjoy the opportunity of making a speech on this occasion, but the proprieties of the case forbid that I should undertake that effort at this late hour. However, there are one or two suggestions which I wish to make.

We all enjoyed that grand meeting last night on the subject of the industrial, commercial and financial effects to be produced by arbitration. We listened to those several gentlemen, and I think that every one of us wished that they could keep on a little longer, for the subject was so broad that it seemed as if we did not get the whole of it. Now it happened to be the case that in large measure the gentlemen who spoke took as a starting point the position of capital in relation to arbitration, because their associations are with capital. The industrial question was not touched on as fully as it seems to me to be desirable that it should be, and I wanted simply to call your attention to that omission.

The nations of the earth other than our own, the industrial nations of the earth, for many years past, have been comparing the prosperity of our people as a whole with the prosperity of their people as a whole, and students have devoted a good deal of attention to the explanation of the difference. As I understand the matter, the general consensus of opinion has been that our favored condition as compared with that of the masses of the people of other lands is that in those lands the people are burdened beyond endurance by militarism and the taxation growing out of war. I give you the suggestion for whatever it may be worth. I make no assertion in relation to it, but I believe it to be true that that is the cause of the great burden under which the toiling peoples of the Old World have been struggling, and from which we have been in so large a measure until recently exempt.

THE CHAIRMAN: I felt last night that there was a little gap in the discussion. If we could only have had some representative of the great labor organizations to talk to us last night — Mr. Gompers, or Mr. Mitchell, or Mr. Sargent, or some of those men, it would have added to the interest.

MR. A. K. SMILEY: We will get one next year.

COMMANDER WADHAMS: *Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I wish to bring you a brief word of cheer. The speakers have been saying that we must go out and work upon lines of education, that we must educate the people. You need not spend a moment upon the navy; the men of the navy are already educated and converted, and believe in arbitration. Did you ever think of it, that it is not we who are educated to bear arms who make wars? On the contrary, others make the war, and then they say to us, "Now the war is on, make peace, and make it as quickly as you can." And when we make the peace, if it is not according to the pleasure and the whim of somebody who has not fired a gun, then we have nothing but condemnation at their hands.

There are but four military nations of the world, Russia, Germany, France and Japan. There are also only four manufacturing, trading and industrial nations of the world, the United States, England, Germany and France. I bring to you a word of truth from the greatest military nation of the world, Russia. In my brief experience of thirty-seven years of wearing a sword in the service of our country, accidentally I fell in a short time ago, while I was in command of one of our ships at Madeira, with the largest product of the finished ship from the Russian dock yards. As I went on board to pay the official call which the international regulations require as ships meet each other, I said, as I stood in the cabin of this Russian captain, "Please excuse me, I want to ask you a question that comes to my mind: What are your feelings, what do you think when you remember that you are the representative of the greatest military power of the world?" He said, "Be seated, and I will tell you. I have never had the question asked before, but I was thinking as I came here in this latest ship from our government dock yards that I do represent the greatest military power in the world, and quickly came with it the thought that my Czar was determined to have peace during his life." I have no reason to question the word of this officer when he stated that he knew that the great desire of the Czar was for peace. Then he spoke of the Hague Conference, and so on. When he returned my call, as he stood in my cabin when I begged him to sit down he made the remark: "Before I sit down I want to say, sir, that while you refer to our nation as the greatest military power of the world, we all realize that the United States of America is the greatest trader and the most powerful and the richest nation in the world, and any time she wants to become the greatest military power, all the world cannot prevent it." I agreed with him, but I said, "We shall never be there."

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to call your attention to the well-known historical fact that one of the greatest diplomats that the United States has produced, and one of the greatest of the world, was an officer of the American navy, a man who probably has done more as a diplomat than any other to accomplish lasting good for mankind, Com. Matthew C. Perry. When he went to Japan and opened its doors to the world in a peaceful way, he displayed great skill, worthy to rank him with Benjamin Franklin and with Webster and Seward in our diplomatic service. He has recently received from the people of Japan such a tribute as no other man has received. The people of Japan, appreciating his great service, have from the Emperor down contributed funds to build a monument to him, and have just dedicated it on the spot where he first placed foot in Japan. I wanted to say this much in regard to the peaceful accomplishments of the navy.

HON. W. J. COOMBS: I have been requested by the Business Committee to prepare a telegram which I shall read to you. We have met here in this Conference many of the faces that we have seen from year to year, but there is one commanding figure that we have all missed, that of the man who wrote "The Man Without a Country," and yet who is himself a citizen of every country, a member of every household, and an inhabitant of every heart, the Rev. Edward Everett Hale. Age has not dried up the springs of his activity, but in his perennial youth he is constantly devising measures of good. So the Business Committee have thought it well that we should let him know that we have not forgotten him, and I have been requested to present this telegram for the action of the Conference:

"REV. E. E. HALE, *Boston*. The Mohonk International Arbitration Conference misses you greatly and sends loving greetings. Although absent, your spirit has pervaded the meetings."

The Conference, by a rising vote, approved this action of the Business Committee, and the telegram was accordingly sent, signed by the Chairman of the Conference, Mr. Foster, and Secretary Woodruff.

Mr. A. K. Smiley explained that Dr. Hale had been expected, but that he had been detained at the last moment.

[For an account of the beginning of the organization of "The American Association of Ministers to Promote Peace," which occupied a few moments at this session of the Conference, see Appendix.]

THE CHAIRMAN: When I agreed to accept the place of presiding officer which I had been invited to fill, I gave notice that I should be obliged to leave this afternoon, so that Mr. Smiley, who has full power in this matter, will provide a substitute for the evening session. I am very sorry that I cannot remain.

Mr. Foster then thanked the Business Committee and the officers of the Conference for the way they had coöperated with him, and referred in most appreciative terms to the hospitality and kindness received from Mr. Smiley.

MR. SMILEY: I know that I voice the sentiment of every member of this Conference when I say that we very much regret the necessity of our very honored and valuable presiding officer leaving this afternoon. We looked the country over and we saw in him just the man we had in our mind. Every one we consulted said: "Mr. Foster is the man, if you can get him." We got him, and now we are going to keep him; he is coming next year to preside.

Mr. Smiley then made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Woodruff and passed unanimously by a rising vote, that the thanks of the Conference be tendered to Mr. Foster for his very efficient service.

Mr. Smiley announced that he had asked Dr. Trueblood to take the chair for the evening session.

The Conference then adjourned.

Sixth Session.

Friday Evening, May 30, 1902.

In the enforced absence of Mr. Foster, as previously explained, the closing session of the Conference was called to order by Dr. Trueblood at 8 o'clock.

The first business of the evening was the appointing of a Publication Committee, consisting of Dr. Trueblood, Mr. Dennis and Mr. Woodruff.

The first speaker of the evening was then announced, Mr. Charles N. Judson of Brooklyn, N. Y.

ADDRESS OF CHARLES N. JUDSON.

THE FOCUSING OF PUBLIC OPINION.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Modesty would have bade me be still to-night, were it not for the fact that my desire to do all I can, — little though it may be, — in return for the generosity of our hosts, overcomes all my natural tendencies, and makes me bold when otherwise I should be timid.

We have heard from several lawyers during the sessions of this convention, and have heard from other lawyers during preceding conventions, and have noticed that with great unanimity and with their usual conservatism they have expressed their doubts about the successful outcome of any scheme of international arbitration. To a lawyer agreements are of little value unless they can be enforced, and a lawyer cannot see how such an agreement can be enforced.

That something is needed to make it a definite, attainable end, and that *that* something has not yet been discovered or developed, seems to be conceded. We all agree that when the time comes that the passions that lead to war are aroused, when the bow of peace has become a shotgun, when men have been filled with the torrent that precedes the enthusiasm of war, the nation will be swept into actual hostilities before it really knows the direction of the current, and will find, perhaps too late, that the only way of getting over the stream would be by going with the current.

Until, therefore, some scheme for enforcing an agreement of international arbitration is discovered, the next best thing is to see to it that we as a people adhere to any such agreement, even though it be not enforceable. As was suggested at the last Conference by our

good friend, Mr. Coombs, "Every nation must work out its own salvation." In this respect nations are much like individuals. This thought was cleverly expressed by a somewhat garrulous but usually pertinent philosopher anent a certain *cas célèbre* of recent date: "If every Frenchman will take care of his own honor, the honor of the French nation will take care of itself." So it is with international arbitration. If every nation will take care of its own passions, international arbitration will take care of itself.

But how shall this best be done? The business of suppressing war-like tendencies is a good deal like suppressing a fire. It must be taken in hand early. Every minute saved at the outbreak of a fire is worth hours spent afterward in extinguishing it. So it comes about that every well-equipped fire department has as a necessary adjunct a fire-alarm system, and this fire-alarm system is by far the best part of the department. Now is there not something in the nature of a fire-alarm system that may be successfully applied to our proposed plan for international arbitration, which is right within our grasp if we only see fit to utilize it — some means by which the people of the United States may take care of their own side of any international dispute which might lead to war and may keep themselves to their agreement for arbitration?

In point of fact, there are in the United States, and probably in every other nation of the world, two classes, one of which profits by and naturally desires and seeks for war, the other honestly desires and seeks for peace.

Suppose, for example, the Venezuelan Proclamation had been issued at Washington this morning, and that word of it had reached New York at noon, what would you have seen? Why, by the "owl train" to-night fifty drum corps would be marching on Washington. They would not go beating drums. They would be another kind of drummers, not so noisy, but quite as efficacious. They would not believe in arbitration. They would want war and would push the Administration into it before it knew where it was going, all agreements for arbitration to the contrary notwithstanding. There would go the heavy ordnance corps. They don't have a chance at money-making very often, and would put arbitration aside with the usual political cry, "Wait until next time!" There would go the equipment corps with the same cry, the cavalry corps, the small arms corps, the ship corps, the yacht corps,—ready to be converted, but not to a better life, — the clothing corps, and many other corps. The catalogue is too long and would weary you if I were to name them all; but all would be for war, none for arbitration. Behind all these corps — far, far behind, and after the fire of enthusiasm for war had gotten way beyond control — comes public opinion with its slow, solemn tread, utterly powerless to resist. The nation would be consumed before the engines of arbitration had gotten a single stream on the fire.

But is there no way in which public opinion may be brought to

bear in support of international arbitration before all these drum corps have had their day?

There is an interesting bit of history that I propose to read that shows how public opinion was brought to bear, though in a small way, in one case, and that may point out lines along which that same public opinion may be brought to bear in a more general way, to make international arbitration a real vital force to prevent war. You will remember that in December, 1895, the Venezuelan Proclamation was issued by the President and caused no little anxiety. The Saturday following, this cablegram was received by the pastor of a well-known church in Brooklyn :

“DEC. 22, 1895.
BERRY.”

“Queen Street sends greeting and prays for perfect accord between England and America.”

Mr. Berry was the pastor of the Queen Street Congregational Church of Wolverhampton, Eng. That message was read from Plymouth pulpit the next Sunday, and in reply this message was sent the same day :

“The great congregation of Plymouth Church, by unanimous rising vote, returns greetings. We join in prayer for peace with kin across the sea.”

At the weekly prayer meeting of Plymouth Church the next Friday evening the following resolutions were passed and telegraphed to Mr. Berry :

Resolved, That a war with Great Britain would be at this time the greatest calamity which could afflict the civilized world or hinder the progress of the kingdom of Christ, and would be especially horrible as involving us in hostilities with our peaceful neighbors of Canada, who have no concern with the alleged occasion thereof.

Resolved, That we deem it the duty of every Christian Church to protest vigorously against all acts and utterances tending to commit the nation primarily to any war, and especially to one not recognized after exhaustive consideration as unavoidable.

Two or three years afterward I chanced to be in the office of one of the under-secretaries for foreign affairs in Whitehall, London. After my special business was finished Mr. Secretary said to me, “I suppose you know of Plymouth Church in Brooklyn.” I said, “I am an attendant there.” He said, “Do you know that Plymouth Church did much toward preventing a war between England and the United States some years since?” He then took from a case the cablegrams which I have read and said, “That Venezuelan message made My Lord hot under the collar, but after these Plymouth Church messages were received from Mr. Berry we heard nothing more.”

Now, I call this focusing public opinion ; and does it not suggest a great opportunity within the grasp of this convention for methodically focusing public opinion throughout the whole United States? Only think of the thousands and thousands of fire-alarm boxes that are located all over the United States, in every church of every

denomination, in every city, town and village, that need only be put into telegraphic connection with the administration at Washington to make the sentiment that we know exists felt and heeded in spite of all the drum corps that would drive us into war.

This is my suggestion, which I leave as a legacy to this convention: Let there be appointed a central committee of one to be located at Washington, who shall have his hand upon the pulse of the administration. Let there be also a treasurer, such as we have now, and then, in addition to our general secretary, let there be assistant secretaries assigned from every religious denomination in the United States. The duty of each of these several assistants shall be to possess himself of the name and location of every church in his denomination. Then when there comes danger of war these men can be communicated with. They in their turn will reach out to the congregations that they have listed, so that in less than ten days we may have at Washington remonstrances against any further proceedings towards war. And not only will it be a general remonstrance, but every congregation will send to its own Representative and its own Senator instructions to act against war. This is simply putting the lines of a war-alarm telegraph into the hands of our general committee at Washington, which may forestall the action of the drummers who want war rather than peace. Thus would I focus public opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to have the very great pleasure of listening to Miss Sarah F. Smiley.

ADDRESS OF SARAH F. SMILEY.

THE INDIVIDUAL SEED-SOWING.

I have but a very few words to say. I think we have come to that time when the question must be being put to all our hearts: What is to be the fruit of this assembly? What are to be the results of it? And then each one is asking after that: What can I do to promote the interests of this great cause? And following that question there will no doubt often be just a little discouragement in the hearts of many here, a little self-distrust; you will feel that it is not in your power to do the great things that some of the great men do, and there will be a longing that you could do those things.

I have thought that it might possibly help to encourage the self-distrustful ones if I should tell them a little dream that I had some years ago; not that I believe much in dreams, but this one seemed to be parabolic.

I thought it was the time of harvest, and that a large number of people were bringing in the results of their harvest; and some of the loads that came in were heaped very high with corn and grain, and looked exceedingly beautiful and abundant. One after another they brought them in, and as they were brought I seemed to understand that that was the fruit of life, that these loads represented

what each one had been permitted to do in this world. And then when I came to my own, all I had to lift up was just a little trace of corn, something that I could hold in my hand; and it looked so small, so little, that my heart almost failed me in comparing it with that of others, till some one by my side whispered, "Isn't it seed corn?" That gave me a wonderful cheer; I thought, "Why, yes; and if it's sown, and should all spring up and come to harvest, it would be abundant."

Now it seems to me that God has been putting into our hands this seed corn. It may not be very much, but each one of us holds something that has been given to us here that we can take away and use — some truth, some principle, some great idea that we can carry away and sow in some other heart. We can do a great deal in this world by simply imparting to others what we have learned ourselves.

I think that a very large portion of the work of the world must go on in this individual fashion; not by great speeches, not by great occasions, but by simple words dropped here and there in a very quiet way, always, however, leaving their mark.

When I was in England in 1870 it was my very great privilege on one occasion to take part in a meeting for some benevolent cause, I forget exactly what just now. That eminent philanthropist, Lord Shaftesbury, was there and took part in it, making a very powerful and telling address, while I also said a few words. The next day I received a very beautiful note from him. It would not be at all fitting for me to tell all that was in the note, but at the end came this passage: "May the people of your great country and the people of my own dear land ever be, by God's grace, as much of one heart and mind as you and I are." I have so often thought of those words; the whole of it lay in that "you and I." We have to come down from the two great nations to be individuals — you and I; and it is by these individual and personal friendships, one here and another there, that peace and harmony are really brought about in the world.

I suppose that none of us feel very much afraid of any great war just now against our own country, but there certainly is a very grave peril facing us in the future, and every thoughtful person who travels much must see it; we must feel that there is a peril before us in the difference of races in this country. We see signs of very great alarm already, and one wonders how arbitration is ever to reach that, how it could possibly be submitted to any court. Now we must deal with that in the very bud; there is something akin to arbitration which we can act upon in such a matter as that. We must set to work one by one, you and I, each one of us, finding some one with whom we can create a bond of friendship, and try in every possible way to anticipate this peril.

I think that by and by, when the great menace comes, it can only be really averted by a large number of personal confidences; that is, that each one when first fired with passion would suddenly remember that he has some friend upon the other side, some one in whom he

can place confidence, some one who can cool his temper and his passion — and the storm would go down. Therefore it is important for us, in an individual and a personal way, to cultivate these friendships and these alliances.

I think that the very great fault of benevolent associations in this country is this: that we do so much by committees, so much on a grand scale, so much by meetings in which we do not see the people themselves. There has been a great deal of correction of that lately, but we need to come right down to see what they are and where they live, and to know all about their concerns and interests, and to come into real, living touch with them. It is the "you and I" that will tell finally in the harmony of the nation.

So that each of us must take our little seed, our little grain of corn, and take it away and plant it; and each of us, day by day, and week by week, and month by month, and year by year, must sow on and on until there will be a great harvest. We scarcely realize what we can do in this very simple way. I think Elizabeth Barrett Browning has summed it up for us in one of her beautiful sonnets, "Work," in a very telling way:

"What are we set on earth for? Say, to toil;
Nor seek to leave thy tending of the vines
For all the heat o' the day, till it declines,
And death's mild curfew shall from work assoil.
God did anoint thee with his odorous oil
To wrestle, not to reign; and he assigns
All thy tears over, like pure crystallines,
For younger fellow-workers of the soil
To wear for amulets. So others shall
Take patience, labor, to their heart and hand,
From thy hand and thy heart and thy brave cheer,
And God's grace fructify through thee to all.
The least flower, with a brimming cup, may stand
And share its dewdrop with another near."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Business Committee has followed out your instructions and provided a draft of a declaration or platform, and this platform will now be presented by the Chairman of the Committee, the Hon. John I. Gilbert.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN I. GILBERT.

In this platform which I am about to read I hope it may be found that there is some seed corn; otherwise it is hardly worth while to read it. We have just heard from Miss Smiley something about the quiet, individual work "between you and me." We read that when the early disciples were persecuted they went abroad preaching. The word translated "preaching" means simply talking, not preaching in the modern sense of the word. They had seen something, they had received an inspiration, and naturally they talked about it. Now we can go home everywhere preaching, talking, and we can

go in the spirit of the address to which we have just listened with so much delight.

[Mr. Gilbert then read the platform and moved its adoption.]

PLATFORM OF THE EIGHTH LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

We affirm the principles declared by former Conferences, and rejoice in the continued progress in their application.

The Golden Rule as a practical law of conduct is not less binding upon nations than upon individuals. Upon obedience to this law depends the welfare of all alike. This is not the dream of enthusiasts, but the practical judgment of the sober-minded men and women who are doing the world's best thinking in the conduct of its affairs.

We believe in the unity of the human race and the brotherhood of mankind, and, that being of kin, the spirit of kindness and of justice should be, and some day will be, universal, recognizing no distinctions of class or race or nationality. In this spirit and in obedience to this law we seek the adoption of the judicial method of settling international disputes, in order that the ends of justice may be attained and the sufferings and burdens of war may be avoided.

Arbitration and appeal to courts of justice are the only rational methods of settling disputes, which fail of direct settlement, whether between individuals or nations.

We rejoice in the progress which has been made during the past year. The great Court provided for at The Hague, and subsequently established and recognized by the leading nations of the world, has been resorted to since the last meeting of our Conference. The governments of the United States and of Mexico have just agreed to refer to that august tribunal the settlement of a disputed claim which for half a century they have been unable to adjust. The importance of this event is not measured by the magnitude of the claim. It marks an epoch in the adjustment of international controversies and the development of international law.

During the year also the representatives of ten republics of Spanish America have agreed to recommend to their respective governments a treaty which provides for the submission of substantially all their differences to the Hague tribunal.

Chile and Argentina have agreed to submit all their controversies to that Court, to stop the projected construction of new armaments, and to remove existing causes of contention.

The representatives of all the American Republics at the Pan-American Conference recently held at Mexico City have given their adhesion to the conventions adopted by the Hague Conference. They have also signed a protocol for the submission to the Hague Court of all cases arising from the claims of the citizens of one country against another.

The Conference earnestly hopes that these conventions adopted at Mexico City will be speedily ratified by the United States and all other signatory American governments.

We look forward hopefully to the time when self-interest, in addition to the imperative sense of duty, will impel all nations to submit all their controversies to the arbitrament of this Court.

All our hopes, however, will prove illusory unless systematic, comprehensive and earnest work is done in educating and developing an enlightened public sentiment and opinion, which shall both demand and support it. To this end we call upon all schools, from the primary to the university, upon the press, the pulpit, boards of trade and commerce, merchants' associations, trade leagues and all other organizations, upon all employers and employed, upon all men everywhere, to cooperate in creating a universal sentiment in favor of the judicial settlement of controversies.

I do not know that it is necessary to add anything, but perhaps a word may not be without use.

The first Conference held here on this subject sought to promote the adoption of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain for the settlement of controversies. That was a great thing to look forward to, and it was well worth while to call a conference of the best persons that could be convoked for that purpose. But mark the purpose — it was confined to the making of a treaty between two countries. The first Conference was in 1895, a very short time ago. How quickly we outgrew that purpose; how quickly we passed beyond what we then sought! In a little while we began to think of the establishment of a permanent international court. That, I think, was in 1897. Well, there were some good men, philanthropists and patriots, who said, "That is away off in the distance, beyond our reach." But there were others who believed that it was eternally right and fit and just, and therefore practical, that there should be a permanent court into which the nations could come and have their controversies settled; and so we dared to hope for it, we dared to look forward to it.

When we assembled last year the great nations of the earth had met in council; they had talked the matter over face to face,—it was "you and I" in that Conference,—and they decided that it was time for the establishment of a court for the judicial investigation and impartial decision of any of the controversies that might arise among any of the nations of the earth. It is astonishing to think how much has been done in so short a time!

Now this Court is established, and the question arises, Is it merely a resplendent possibility? Will the nations bring their controversies into it for adjudication, or will it stand out as a shining illustration of what the world ought to do, but is reluctant to accept? That question has already been answered by the submission of one controversy to this Court.

I do not think that the importance of that submission is to be measured by the size of the question. It is an immensely great thing to have two nations of the world go into that Court and set it into operation. You recall that at first litigants were reluctant to go into the Supreme Court of the United States. It was a long time before even small cases were brought before it. And we heard to-day, in the exceedingly valuable discourse by Chief-Justice Nott, how distrustful people were of the United States Court of Claims. At first only small cases were reluctantly brought into it, but when the court had gained the confidence of the people, the multitude and the magnitude of the cases brought into it were astonishing. It is a magnificent illustration of what this Court of arbitration is just as surely bound to do as to-morrow's sun is bound to rise. There cannot be any doubt about it in the nature of things.

So much for that. What I have said thus far is for the purpose of suggesting how the cause of arbitration has grown. A thing that has in it the possibility of such growth has also in it the promise of permanency and of power and of usefulness. It is beginning to grow and it will continue to grow. It has the soil of the human

heart to grow in; it has the sweet light and rain of heaven to nourish it. The mustard seed was small and apparently of little consequence, yet it became so large that the birds of the air came and lodged in its branches. And so I say that this little seed that has been planted in the soil of the human heart in the form of the tribunal at The Hague has in it the promise of growth, and the nations of the earth are going to come under the shadow of it and rejoice in it. It is as sure as that God is God, and that His eternal laws will prevail.

Now we have a part in this matter. We have put into our platform some of the things which are vital in the development of all that we, as members of this Conference, hope for. Those hopes spring from the unity of the human race — the brotherhood of mankind. We are all of kin; and you know that “kinned” is etymologically the same as “kind.” And, being of kin, shall not the nations of the earth become just and kind to each other? I believe they will. When, I do not know, but it is coming. The prophetic as well as poetic soul of Burns had a vision of it in the distance when he said :

“ It’s coming yet, and a’ that,
That man to man, the warld o’er,
Shall brothers be, for a’ that.”

We have nearly reached the close of our Conference; we believe that our meetings have sown much seed, the culture of which rests, in a measure, with each of us.

The motion to adopt the platform was seconded by Mr. John B. Garrett, who said :

REMARKS OF JOHN B. GARRETT.

Before the invitation came to me to second this motion I had been pondering somewhat by way of comparison of this with previous conferences, and especially upon the origin of this movement in the early summer of 1895, when a mere handful, a few scores of persons at the most, responded to the invitation of our host. I believe that in the providence of God the Mohonk International Arbitration Conference came into being when it did. Our host was the instrument of the Supreme Ruler of the universe. He was accustomed to listen to the inspeaking word of God; he heard it and obeyed. And when we remember that it was but a few months after that first meeting that the Venezuelan difficulty occurred, we must, I think, recognize the fact that it would have been practically impossible for any one to have got together the friends of international arbitration immediately after that occurrence or while that difficulty was pending, and equally difficult at some other stages of the intervening years between 1895 and this moment. We must recognize that our Heavenly Father, in His infinite wisdom and for the purposes of carrying forward His work of Christian civilization in the world, moved upon the heart of our host just when He did.

Had he not responded at that time it is a matter of exceeding doubt whether this company of two hundred or more persons would have gathered in 1902, and whether the origin of this instrumentality in carrying forward the work for the promotion of the world's peace would not have been postponed to an even yet future date.

I take especial pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of this Declaration because it not only reaffirms all the important judgments which have been made matters of record by the seven preceding conferences, but because it plants this work for the first time distinctly upon the broad principle of the unity of the race, the brotherhood of man; then it proceeds to point out practical methods whereby, as we leave this place, we may carry on the work which has interested us so much here.

As I have compared this Conference with those which have preceded it (and I have attended the majority of them), while at times to-day I have had a little distrust and was uncertain whether we should rise to the high tide which we had reached on some previous occasions, I feel that we shall leave to-night with a confident conviction that the work of the Conference has been as well or better performed than that of any of its predecessors, and inspired with a new and holy hope that the work which has called us together shall be carried forward as God wills it.

There has been, I believe, a tendency with some to minimize the importance of the Hague Conference and Convention. I will admit with the honored Chairman who has left us that it imposes no obligation upon any nation of the world, and that it does no more than open a channel whereby the ends sought may be wrought out. But the matter must have a beginning. That may be all that is necessary, not only for the moment, but for all time. It may be that there is no necessity that any obligatory measure shall be adopted by the nations of the world. Sure it is that there is in being to-day a court established by the concurrent action of twenty-six of the leading nations of the globe, whereby every difference of whatever character which they may choose to refer to it may be adjudicated, and that in accordance with the law of nations.

I have no fear whatever that when the decision of that court is rendered it will be made nugatory by the action or inaction of any of the nations involved. All precedents in our own country and in the world's history go to indicate that when the decision of such a court is rendered—a court of the highest character—it will be obeyed, the public opinion of the world will sustain it; and no nation, however strong it may be, can dare to deny the execution of the justice which has been reached through such a tribunal.

I agree, my friends, fully with what has been said to us so tenderly and so sweetly to-night by Miss Smiley with regard to our individual duty; on the other hand, I recognize that we are living in an institutional age, an age of coöperation, of organization; I appreciate that this company ramifies society through all these Eastern States on very many lines. There is scarcely one of us who is not associated

in many institutions through which we may operate to the fulfillment of the duty which the Declaration imposes.

First of all are the churches. And if Plymouth Church, as Mr. Judson told us, was so conspicuously instrumental in arresting the war that was threatened between Great Britain and America in the winter of 1895-6, what may we not hope when the Christian churches of America are united in upholding the banner of the Prince of Peace to the world, and when we speak unitedly to any nation (our own or any other), telling it that the time has come when we dare not lay hands one upon another?

Then come the mercantile, industrial, economic, and financial institutions and organizations, the trades leagues, the merchants' associations, and others which have been brought to our attention through their representatives who have spoken to us. May every one of these representatives go back to his duty in connection with those associations with a clearer conviction that international arbitration is a practical method of settling the disputes between the nations of this world!

The educational side of this work has been very largely dwelt upon. The people who are needing education are first of all the members of the industrial, commercial, and financial organizations of this great nation, and it is for the men who are here present to set in motion the instrumentalities whereby that educational work shall be accomplished.

I want to reaffirm the great principle of the brotherhood of man as that upon which the work of this Conference must stand if it is to have any permanence. Were we to work selfishly in the interest of the industries and the outward prosperity of the United States of America alone, we should have little hope of success. Is it not too evident to all of us that the tendency of the legislation of this nation, of which we are so proud, has been in the main in the past a selfish legislation? I remember some years ago talking with a Senator of the United States,—a strong advocate of the protective policy,—and he attempted to define to me the difference between self-interest and selfishness. He said that this legislation, of which he was so ardent an advocate, was not selfish, it was in self-interest, and that unless one took care of himself no one would take care of him. There is a measure of truth in it, but, after all, that self-interest, if we devote ourselves to it too assiduously, leads us beyond all question into pure selfishness. And the time has come in the history of this great nation when we have need to look far off, throughout the borders of the Eastern as well as of the Western Hemisphere, and to recognize that in God's providence the citizens of Asia, of Africa and of South America are all our brothers, for whom we directly or indirectly must legislate. The time has passed when this nation can afford to adopt any scheme of industrial or financial legislation that does not take into primary consideration the essential underlying fact that all men are the children of the same Father; that we are brothers; that all men are born free and equal; and that upon this unity of the

human race rests the prosperity of our own nation as well as of the kindred nations of the world.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before the Chair submits to vote the motion for the adoption of the platform, he will call upon President Charles H. Levermore of Adelphi College, Brooklyn, to further support it with a few remarks.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: It seems to me that we come to the Lake Mohonk Conference in the spirit of the Psalmist who said: "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help." We come to this hill for help for the broadening and quickening of our ideals, and for the satisfaction of our hopes for the amelioration of the condition of mankind. I take it that the determination to have peace in the world is the underlying purpose of our coming here. The establishment of international arbitration is after all but an incident in the cultivation of the will that there shall be no more war, that universal peace among the nations of our civilization, at any rate, shall be attained. And this mountain has become the altar of peace to us. It is easy to be an optimist here, and it is a great privilege to come where we may for this short period, at any rate, be thoroughgoing optimists.

It seems to me that the few nations which constitute our civilization have already reached that point in their development where war between them is almost impossible, the forces that work for the maintenance of peace in the heart of our civilization are so enormous. We may expect wars upon the fringes of the world, but in our European and American civilization it is difficult for us to see the place where war is a possibility, unless it is in the event of the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, and I am optimistic enough to believe that even there the forces that are already at work in our civilization to make war impossible will prevent hostilities when the aged Emperor dies who holds that monarchy together to-day.

We have heard these forces summarized: the wonderful spirit of Christian sympathy among all these nations which belong to our civilization, something that has never existed before our own day; the rapid growth of the organizations for industrial amelioration and arbitration, not only in our own land, but in the other lands that are our kin; the feeling of solidarity in our commercial and industrial interests; and last, but not least, the new view of the interests of the high policy of nations now taken by the chancellors of Europe, by the statesmen who manage the foreign affairs of this group of nations.

I think it would be fair to say that there is a Lake Mohonk Conference in session in Europe all the time. When the young Emperor William ascended the throne of Germany a great many shook their heads and said, "Here is a young Hotspur, and the peace of Europe

is endangered by his accession." The Emperor William, who is undoubtedly one of the most astute of statesmen, has from the time when he took the helm of his own ship to this day been eager to put Germany in the forefront, to make it a world power, but without going to war. And his policy has been remarkably successful along just those lines. The monarchs and the ministers who advise them may not be always acting in the promotion of this policy from motives that are highly ideal or philanthropic. It is easy to see, however, that such a policy is absolutely necessary for most of them even from the most immediate and personal considerations. There is the terrible financial risk which every war will bring to them now; there is the political risk, for any war that involves a great power may shake the throne of that power to ruin. So that it seems to me I am justified in saying that the governing families of Europe are a Mohonk Conference in perpetual session, and that their influence from one motive or another is always to be thrown on the side of the cause for whose triumph we are hoping and praying, and they are working with us; for he who is not against us is with us. Mr. Mead calls for the organization of the world, and when the monarchs and their advisers and the great captains of industry and kings of commerce and philanthropists and educators are all traveling the same road and working for the same end, whatever their motives may be, we certainly have gone very far towards that organization.

But if there is one weak point in our campaign it seems to me that it lies in the possible fact that we have been doing too much from above and too little from below. Treaties and arrangements between secretaries of state are not likely to have great permanent value unless they represent a strong, active, popular sentiment. It seems to me that what Mr. Howes very happily called the "Morganization" of the world is, on the whole, the best thing that has been done during the last generation to build up a popular sentiment which shall support this determination to have universal peace. When the great enterprises of the nations on either side of the Atlantic are under one direction, and the financial interests of the world are in one group and practically under one direction, the great interests allied together which form those controlling influences have their hand on monarchs and statesmen and on the people, and neither the top nor the bottom can move unless they consent.

But it is the work of the people that is going to be most effective, because in our democratic era we must look for that which comes from below up, if we want to find something permanent and permanently valuable. Therefore I urge that we should go away from here with the determination to bring this crusade down to the "you and I," about which Miss Smiley spoke so beautifully. We teachers must see to it that our school histories are written better than they have been, and taught better than they have been, along the lines that concern universal peace and the hatred of war, and patriotism of the true kind. I am myself, for one, going home with the determination to do what I can in the educational field, in which I have

some little influence, to help along the correct understanding and teaching of this gospel among the young people.

It gives me great pleasure to second the motion to adopt the platform which has been read.

The motion to adopt the platform was then carried by unanimous vote.

The HON. JOHN FIELD of Philadelphia moved the adoption of the following vote of thanks :

Resolved, That the Eighth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration expresses its high appreciation of the hospitality of Mr. and Mrs. Albert K. Smiley and Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Smiley, and of their efforts for the furtherance of the cause, believing that the series of conferences for which they have so wisely planned tends to hasten the establishment among men of the universal reign of the Prince of Peace.

Resolved, That we gratefully acknowledge the graceful generosity of our host, Mr. A. K. Smiley, who has given his personal attention to the comfort and pleasure of his guests, and has, by his wisdom, tact, and skill, promoted the deliberations of the Conference and assisted in guiding it to happy conclusions. We congratulate him on the success which has attended this Conference, and pray that he may live to plan for conferences of still wider influence and effectiveness.

Mr. Field then said :

Mr. Chairman : One word about our host. I have said to myself, Were it possible to take the eyes of this Conference and concentrate them in one eye ; were it possible to weld all the arms of this Conference in one great strong arm ; were it possible to voice with one voice the sentiment of this Conference, or to take the earnest heart-throbs that have beat in the breast of every man and woman here and combine them in one,— with one look of that magnified eye, and one shake of that great strong arm, and one utterance of that voice, and one throb of that great heart, I might in some poor way convey to our host the feelings of gratitude and pleasure of this Conference.

MR. OSCAR LAPHAM of Providence said : It is my agreeable office to second these resolutions. The spontaneous expressions that have come day by day from the various speakers in appreciation of the work, the nobility, the humanity, and the hospitality of our host are a better expression than any form of written resolutions.

Our host has set before us a great ideal : the substitution of reason in the settlement of disputes between nations in place of war and carnage. But he has not only announced that principle, which might remain a dormant and inactive proposition to which thousands of people might readily assent, but he has set to work to vitalize it by everything which he could possibly do. He has labored years in the cause of advancing this ideal ; he has used all his possessions to plant it in the minds of the people ; and he has made the consideration of that great proposition so agreeable that it is impossible for us to abstain from taking part and from doing all in our power.

I do not believe that Mr. Smiley stops to consider very much about when or how this great principle is to become established.

He simply advocates it with all his might, and invites others to do the same, because it is the truth, because it is the embodiment of the Golden Rule. He leaves it to the future and to God to say when and how it shall finally become the supreme law of the world.

We cannot express our appreciation any better to the satisfaction of our magnificent host than to take this work home with us, every one of us, into the various communities where we live and where we can do something, and let him know that we are holding Mohonk Conferences at every practicable opportunity in every possible community of this land.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will invite all of you who feel in sympathy with this resolution to rise.

The whole Conference responded by rising.

MR. SMILEY: I want to say that I am very grateful for the expressions of pleasure that you have made, and satisfaction at being here. I do not believe you are half as much pleased as I am at having you here, because this subject of peace on the earth and the desire to promote it have been in my heart for years, and I believed the only way to advance it was that of arbitration.

I think we have made a long step forward this year. I do not think we have ever had a better Conference. I am thoroughly of the belief that the time is coming when the nations of the world will settle the greater portion of their disputes by the Court at The Hague. I believe, further, that the great holiday of the future, in which every nation of the earth will take part, will be the celebration either of the day when the Czar's rescript was issued or the day when the Hague Conference adopted this wonderful provision for a universal tribunal. You know that twenty-one nations of the world have already nominated their foremost men as judges in this Court. When the Court has become operative, people will see it and appreciate it; the world will become more united than we can dream of, and there are young people in this house who will realize it; and the great day chosen to celebrate it will surpass even Christmas as a holiday, because it will cover the whole world, pagan as well as Christian.

Now what little part my brother and I can do towards this end we are determined to do, and we are going to hold these conferences every year and try to make them more and more interesting and successful. I thank you very much for coming here and helping us. We have had a good organization this year, good all around. The hard work has been done by the Business Committee, and the success of the Conference has been a great deal owing to them. We will thank them in our hearts instead of putting a motion to that effect.

I hope you will all have a pleasant trip home.

At Mr. Smiley's request the audience then sang the hymn, "God Be With You Till We Meet Again," and the Chairman declared the Conference at an end.

MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE.

- ALLEN, REV. F. B. and MRS., 1 Joy St., Boston, Mass.
ALLEN, REV. JOHN K. and MRS., Tarrytown, N. Y.
AMEN, PRINCIPAL H. P., Exeter, N. H.
ANDERSON, JOHN F., JR., 1325 Pacific St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
ARNOLD, BENJAMIN WALWORTH, 11 Ten Broeck St., Albany, N. Y.
BAILEY, MRS. HANNAH J., Winthrop Centre, Me.
BAILY, JOEL J. and MRS., 1826 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
BAILY, JOSHUA L., 1624 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
BAKER, O. M. and MRS., Springfield, Mass.
BALCH, FRANCIS N., 23 Court St., Boston, Mass.
BALLANTINE, REV. W. G. and MRS., 321 St. James Ave., Springfield, Mass.
BANCROFT, WILLIAM P. and MRS., Wilmington, Del.
BARTON, PROF. GEO. A. and MRS., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
BENEDICT, HON. R. D. and MRS., 368 Adelphi St., New York.
BIRDSALL, PRES. W. W. and MRS., Swarthmore, Pa.
BLANEY, WILLIAM O. and MRS., 469 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
BRACQ, PROF. J. C. and MRS., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
BRIGHT, MAJ. M. H., Tarrytown, N. Y.
BROWN, JOHN CROSBY and MRS., 36 East 37th St., New York.
BROWN, PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
BUTLER, C. H. and MRS., 71 Broadway, New York.
CARROLL, REV. H. K. and MRS., 150 Fifth Ave., New York.
CHESTER, HON. ALDEN and MRS., Albany, N. Y.
CHURCH, COL. W. C. and MRS., 51 Irving Pl., New York.
COBB, REV. H. E. and MRS., 270 West End Ave., New York.
COBB, HON. HENRY E. and MRS., Newton, Mass.
COBB, REV. L. H. and MRS., 222 West 23d St., New York.
COLLINS, R. S. and MRS., 57 East 55th St., New York.
COOMBS, HON. W. J. and MRS., 63 South Portland Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
CUYLER, REV. DR. T. L. and MRS., 176 South Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
DENNIS, WILLIAM C., Lake Mohonk, N. Y.
DURYEA, MRS. SAMUEL B., 46 Remsen St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
FAGNANI, PROF. C. P., Union Theological Seminary, New York.
FIELD, JOHN, Philadelphia, Pa.
FORBES, FRANCIS and MRS., Mutual Life Building, New York.
FOSTER, HON. JOHN W., 1323 18th St., Washington, D. C.
GARRETT, JOHN B., Rosemont, Pa.
GARRETT, HON. P. C., Logan P. O., Philadelphia, Pa.
GIBSON, A. C. and MRS., Germantown, Pa.
GIBSON, W. H. and MRS., 31 Nassau St., New York.
GILBERT, HON. JOHN I. and MRS., Malone, N. Y.
GILL, W. A., New Paltz, N. Y.

- GOODENOW, HON. J. H., University Club, New York.
 GOULD, MISS HELEN, Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y.
 GRAYHAM, REV. L. Y., 2024 Mt. Vernon St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 HALL, REV. DR. HECTOR and MRS., Troy, N. Y.
 HALLOCK, REV. DR. J. N., 86 Bible House, New York.
 HARTSHORNE, CHARLES, Merion Station, Philadelphia, Pa.
 HASKINS, D. G., 1075 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
 HERSHEY, REV. DR. S. F. and MRS., Newtonville, Mass.
 HOOKER, E. H. and MRS., 2106 Park Row Building, New York.
 HOUGHTON, MRS. L. S., 135 Fifth Ave., New York.
 HOWES, OSBORNE, Brookline, Mass.
 HOWLAND, W. B., 287 Fourth Ave., New York.
 HUBBARD, S. F., 20 Parmenter St., Boston, Mass.
 JEFFERSON, REV. C. E. and MRS., 125 West 44th St., New York.
 JESSUP, DR. SAMUEL and MRS., Oneida, N. Y.
 JOHNSON, REV. DR. HERRICK and MRS., 1070 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
 JONES, HON. W. MARTIN and MRS., Granite Building, Rochester, N. Y.
 JUDSON, CHARLES N. and MRS., 150 Columbia Heights, New York.
 KEELER, MISS LUCY E., 417 Birchard Ave., Fremont, Ohio.
 KING, WILLIAM F. and MRS., 410 Broadway, New York.
 KINGSBURY, F. J., Waterbury, Conn.
 KLINE, MAHLON N. and MRS., 431 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 LANDER, JOHN B. and MRS. (*Commercial Advertiser*), New York.
 LONDON, HON. J. S., Schenectady, N. Y.
 LONDON, MISS, Schenectady, N. Y.
 LAPHAM, HON. OSCAR and MRS., 183 Waterman St., Providence, R. I.
 LE FEVRE, HON. JACOB and MRS., New Paltz, N. Y.
 LEVERMORE, PRES. C. H. and MRS., Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 LEONARD, GEO. H., Hotel Brunswick, Boston, Mass.
 LITTLE, REV. DR. ARTHUR and MRS., 6 Melville Ave., Dorchester, Mass.
 LOVELAND, COL. F. G. and MRS., 214 West 92d St., New York.
 MAINS, REV. G. P. and MRS., 150 Fifth Ave., New York.
 MAYNARD, L. A., 83 Bible House, New York.
 MCINTOSH, HECTOR, 605 North 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 MCKEEN, JAMES and MRS., 136 Henry St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 MCNUTT, RANDOLPH and MRS., 45 East Swann St., Buffalo, N. Y.
 MEAD, EDWIN D. and MRS., 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
 METCALF, HON. HENRY B., Pawtucket, R. I.
 MILLS, PROF. H. E., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 MILNE, PRES. W. J. and MRS., 94 Willett St., Albany, N. Y.
 MORRIS, E. P., 5442 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
 MOXOM, REV. DR. PHILIP S. and MRS., Springfield, Mass.
 MURDOCK, W. A., Huntington Ave. and Gainsboro St., Boston, Mass.
 NOTT, HON. C. C. and MRS., 826 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C.
 PARTINGTON, FREDERICK E. and MRS., New Brighton, N. Y.
 PATTISON, PROF. T. HARWOOD, Rochester, N. Y.
 PEABODY, GEORGE FOSTER, 27 Pine St., New York.
 PEARSON, C. B. and MRS., Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C.
 PLATT, EDWIN P. and MRS., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

- PRESTON, E. G. and MRS., Secretary Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.
- RAYMOND, PRES. A. V. V. and MRS., Schenectady, N. Y.
- REEVES, F. B., Philadelphia, Pa.
- RICHARDSON, CHARLES and MRS., 1307 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- ROSE, WILLIAM J. and MRS., Exchange Building, Boston, Mass.
- SAGEBEER, REV. DR. J. E., Upsal St., Germantown, Pa.
- SANKEY, IRA D., 148 South Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- SCUDDER, PROF. M. T. and MRS., New Paltz, N. Y.
- SEELYE, PRES. L. CLARK, Northampton, Mass.
- SHRIGLEY, PRES. JOHN M. and MRS., Lansdowne, Pa.
- SIMMONS, J. EDWARD and MRS., 28 West 52d St., New York.
- SKINNER, HON. CHAS. R. and MRS., Albany, N. Y.
- SLEICHER, HON. JOHN A. and MRS., Albany, N. Y.
- SMILEY, A. H., Minnewaska, N. Y.
- SMILEY, A. K., Lake Mohonk, N. Y.
- SMILEY, DANIEL and MRS., Lake Mohonk, N. Y.
- SMILEY, MISS SARAH F., 2022 F St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- SMITH, PROF. C. H., New Haven, Conn.
- STEELE, HON. HIRAM R. and MRS., 32 Liberty St., New York.
- STODDARD, REV. DR. C. A., 156 Fifth Ave., New York.
- STRONG, REV. DR. A. H., 17 Sibley Place, Rochester, N. Y.
- STURGIS, WILLIAM C. and MRS., 37 West 20th St., New York.
- SWIFT, D. WHEELER and MRS., Worcester, Mass.
- TALCOTT, JAMES and MRS., 7 West 57th St., New York.
- TAYLOR, J. A. and MRS., 111 Broadway, New York.
- TAYLOR, PRES. J. M. and MRS., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- THAYER, HON. S. R., Minneapolis, Minn.
- THOMAS, DR. R. H. and MRS., 1718 John St., Baltimore, Md.
- THOMPSON, REV. DR. C. L. and MRS., 156 Fifth Ave., New York.
- TOLMAN, DR. W. H. and MRS., 105 East 22d St., New York.
- TRUMBULL, CHAS. G. and MRS., 4103 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- TRUEBLOOD, DR. BENJAMIN F., 31 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
- THOMAS, PRES. M. CAREY, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- VAN SLYKE, REV. DR. J. G. and MRS., Kingston, N. Y.
- VAN NORDEN, WARNER, 751 Fifth Ave., New York.
- WADHAMS, COMMANDER A. V. and MRS., School Ship St. Mary's, Board of Education, New York.
- WADHAMS, HON. F. E. and MRS., Albany, N. Y.
- WHITNEY, W. B. and MRS., Germantown, Pa.
- WHITTAKER, E. G., 141 Broadway, New York.
- WILKINSON, PROF. W. C. and MRS., 5630 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- WOOD, ALEXANDER C. and MRS., Camden, N. J.
- WOOD, JAMES and MRS., Mt. Kisco, N. Y.
- WOODFORD, PROF. A. B., New Haven, Conn.
- WOODRUFF, CLINTON ROGERS and MRS., 707 North American Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS TO PROMOTE PEACE.

During the Conference a number of ministers met, at the request of Rev. Dr. S. F. Hershey, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Boston, and, after consultation, decided to effect, in a simple form, an organization to be known as the American Association of Ministers to Promote Peace, the objects of which were set forth in the following statement :

OBJECTS.

1. To advance in pulpit, press and private conversation the cause of peace.
2. To seek to associate together in this work ministers of all churches.
3. To strive to lead the Church to oppose the settlement of international difficulties by war, and to promote justice, goodwill and peace in conformity with the standard of the Prince of Peace on these vital questions.

All ministers approving of and signing these declarations shall be considered attached to this Association.

The ministers now present this thirtieth day of May, 1902, shall elect a Board of six, who shall elect the President and Secretary; each year one-third of this Board shall retire, and their places shall be filled by the Board.

The President and Secretary shall work under the advice of this Board, and shall contract no expense for which the Board or the Association shall be responsible, except as directed by the Board.

This Association shall strive to work (so far as possible, in conjunction with the American Peace Society) to promote the cause of peace throughout the world, and particularly through the ministers of the gospel over the entire American continent.

DR. HERSHEY, in presenting the statement at the close of the Fifth Session of the Conference, said that he sometimes felt a bit humiliated that the pulpit of the country as a body was so much affected with jingoism and was behind the industrial leaders in the position taken in the holy cause of peace, and needed to be won to it.

DR. ARTHUR LITTLE of Boston, speaking to the subject, said : I should be very sorry as a minister of the Gospel to spend any time in apologizing for the ministers of the land. If what has been said is true to any extent, it is because they have let the public infer their sentiments, rather than by reason of any utterances which could be interpreted as of a jingo order. I think, however, this is a very timely action taken by those who are here to-day, and I hope

it may extend its influence very widely throughout the whole country, because it does furnish an opportunity for the thousands and tens of thousands of ministers in the country to let the whole world know precisely where they stand in this matter. I am ashamed of them if they are behind the industrial or commercial or any other class in following the principles of peace. They ought to be the leaders of this movement.

This action is extremely informal, as you observe, and lacking in force to execute itself unless those who are here shall use their utmost diligence to interest themselves, and unless the committee appointed here to-day shall do their utmost to interest others; it may be a little group of clergymen in large centres first, and later in the smaller centres.

I desire to say, speaking of the denomination which I happen to represent, which has a ministry of five or six thousand clergymen, that at the very moment the Conference at The Hague was organized three years ago, at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts organization, at which there were two or three hundred clergymen present, representing five or six hundred churches, we sent to The Hague a very cordial telegram expressing our hope that that Conference might be successful. I believe that was the feeling of the Massachusetts churches and of the churches throughout the land.

APPENDIX B.

REPLY OF BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE TO RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF LORD PAUNCEFOTE.

Since the pages of this report were made up the following dispatch has been received at Mohonk Lake, from the British Foreign Office, through Ambassador Choate and the State Department, in reply to the resolutions of the Conference relative to the death of Lord Pauncefote.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 7, 1902.

YOUR EXCELLENCY :

I have the honor to acknowledge Your Excellency's note of the 1st inst., enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Lake Mohonk International Arbitration Conference, at its meeting in May last, relative to the death of Lord Pauncefote.

I should be grateful if your Excellency would be so good as to convey, through the proper channel, the appreciation of His Majesty's Government of the testimony borne by the Lake Mohonk Conference to the services rendered by His Majesty's late Ambassador at Washington.

I have the honor to be, etc.,

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

HIS EXCELLENCY,

THE HONORABLE J. H. CHOATE,
ETC., ETC., ETC.

INDEX.

(Names of speakers in small capitals, titles of addresses in italics.)

- Adler, Dr. Felix, 99.
ALLEN, REV. F. B., address of, 54.
American Association of Ministers to Promote Peace, 123.
American Peace Society, work and needs of, 44.
Arbitration, international 6, 7, 29, 90, 100; attitude of the navy towards, 102; cases pending, 10, 11, 13, 41; duty of business men regarding, 96; history of, during the past century, 9; influence of industry and commerce on, 68, 71; influence of Society of Friends on, 42; obligatory, 6, 13, 28, 37, 38, 40, 93; organizations working for, 10; race sovereignty and, 36; present outlook and progress of, 9, 16, 20, 21, 32, 39; skepticism as to ultimate success of, 35; treaties of, 6, 7, 22, 86; unrestricted, opposed in the United States, 8; women's work for, 31, 35, 64.
ARMSTRONG, MISS CLARA J., remarks of, 66.

BENEDICT, HON. R. D., remarks of, 38, 88.
BIRDSALL, PRES. W. W., remarks of, 40; address of, 52.
Blaney, William O., 8.
Bloch, Jean de, 45.
Boundary disputes, World Commission for settlement of, 14.
BRACQ, PROF. JEAN C., address of, 18.
BROWN, JOHN CROSBY, 8; address of, 68.
BROWN, REV. WILLIAM ADAMS, address of, 97.
BUTLER, C. H., remarks of, 23, 41.

CARROLL, DR. H. K., address of, 58.
Central American Republics and arbitration, 7.
Certainty that the Hague Tribunal will be Used, 90.
Chester, Hon. Alden, 8.
Chile and Argentina, 7, 88.
Churches, duty of, in regard to peace, 115, 123, 124.
Commerce and Peace, 39, 68, 71, 78, 81.
Commercial Aspects of International Arbitration, 71.
Compulsory arbitration, 6, 12, 13, 28, 37, 38, 40.
Congress of Nations, 38, 48.
Conquering Power of the Passive Virtues, 56.
COOMBS, HON. WILLIAM J., 8; remarks of, 65, 103.
Court of Claims, an international tribunal, 90, 91.
Cuba and reciprocity, 73.
Cuban teachers at Mohonk Conference, 65.
Cutting, R. Fulton, 8.

Danish West Indies, cession to the United States, 7.
DENNIS, WILLIAM C., 8; remarks of, 65, 105.
Development of international sympathy and interest, 16, 17, 34, 68, 115, 116.
Difficulties to be Overcome, 35.
Diplomacy and settlement of claims, 88.
Dunant, M. Henri, 21.
Duty of peace workers, 13, 82, 97, 108.

Education and peace, 27, 29, 33, 35, 37, 40, 47, 49, 52, 54, 60, 64, 79, 83, 115, 117.

Education of public opinion, 43-66, 79, 97, 105, 117.

Element of Justice in War, The, 24.

Evils and Obstacles to be Overcome, 61.

FIELD, HON. JOHN, remarks of, 118.
Focusing of Public Opinion, 105.

Forbes, Francis, 88.

Force of Public Education, The, 33.

Forces Making for International Arbitration, 24-42.

FOSTER, HON. JOHN W., address of, 84; opening remarks of, 6; remarks of, 22, 32, 40, 49, 87, 88, 89, 103.

France, attitude towards arbitration, 21.

Free Religious Association and peace, 46.

Free speech tabooed during Boer War, 62.

Friends, Society of, and arbitration, 42.

GARRETT, JOHN B., 8, 9, 23; address of, 113.

Garrett, Philip C., 74.

Gibson, W. H., 89.

GILBERT, HON. JOHN I., 8; address of, 110.

Ginn, Edwin, 45.

Glasgow Peace Conference, 13.

Golden Rule in political affairs, 72.

Gumplowicz, Dr., on illusions, 19.

Hague Convention, adherence to, 6, 12, 87.

Hague Court, 11, 12, 13, 22, 48, 89, 114; certainty of use of, 90, 93, 112; new members of, 11; reference of "Pious Fund" dispute, 7.

Hague Peace Conference, 19, 49, 114.

Hale, Dr. E. E., 48; telegram to, 103.

HALLOCK, REV. JOSEPH N., remarks of, 100.

Henry of Navarre, work for arbitration, 22.

HERSHEY, DR. SCOTT F., remarks of, 123.

Histories should recognize work of arbitration and peace, 35, 40, 60, 117.

Holls, Hon. F. W., 19.

HOWES, OSBORNE, address of, 75.

Individual Seed Sowing, The, 108.

Influence of Educated Women for Arbitration and Peace, 29.

Influence of the Higher Institutions of Learning on Public Opinion, 52.

Influence of the industrial, commercial and financial forces of the world on international arbitration, 67-83.

International justice, need of, 19, 20, 48.

International Law Association, 10, 18.

International Law, Institute of, 10.

International Trade Leading to Permanent Peace, 68.

Interparliamentary Peace Union, 10.

JOHNSON, REV. HERRICK, D.D., address of, 56.

JUDSON, CHARLES N., address of, 105.

Justice in war, element of, 24.

KING, WILLIAM F., 8; address of, 71.

KLINE, MAHLON, N., address of, 74.

Ladd, William, work of, 46.

LANDON, HON. JUDSON S., address of, 93.

LAPHAM, HON. OSCAR, 8, 9; remarks of, 118.

LE FEVRE, HON. JACOB, remarks of, 65.

LEVERMORE, PRES. CHARLES H., address of, 116.

LITTLE, DR. ARTHUR, remarks of, 123.

Loeher, Aloys, 43.

Lynching, Frequency of, 61.

MAINS, DR. G. P., remarks of, 89.

Maynard, LaSalle A., 8.

McKEEN, JAMES, address of, 35.

MEAD, EDWIN D., 8; address of, 43.

MEAD, LUCIA AMES, address of, 61.

Members of the Mohonk Conference, 120-122.

METCALF, HON. HENRY B., remarks of, 101.

Mexican International Arbitration Conference, 6, 84; proceedings of, 87.

Military instruction in the schools, 35.

Misjudgments of Other Peoples, 58.

Mohonk Conference, annual report of, 24; influence of, 14, 33, 43, 47, 57, 82, 95, 96, 112, 113; members of, 120-122; permanent organization of, 94-95; platform of, 111.

MOXOM, DR. PHILIP S., address of, 15.

National honor, questions of, 6, 41, 50.

Necessity of better equipment in peace work, 44.

New Paltz Normal School and Cuban teachers, 65, 66.

Nobel prize awarded, 21.

NOTT, HON. C. C., address of, 90.

Officers and Committees of Mohonk Conference, 2.

Our Chief Hope an Educated Public Opinion, 49.

Pan-American Conference at Mexico City, 6, 12; protocols adopted by, 12, 22; work and results of, 84, 85.

Passy, M. Frederic, 21.

Patriotism, 32, 47, 54.

Pauncefote, Lord, tribute to, 8; resolutions on death of, 67; reply of British Foreign Office, 124.

PEABODY, GEORGE FOSTER, 8; remarks of, 42, 67; address of, 81.

Perry, Com. M. C., work for peace, 103.

"Pious Fund" dispute, 7, 11, 12.

Platform of Eighth Mohonk Arbitration Conference, 111.

Plymouth Church, influence for peace, 107.

Politics and peace, 63.

Porto Rico, condition of, 58.

Press and War, The, 63.

Prizes for peace work, 21, 45.

Progress and Present Outlook of Arbitration, The, 9-22.

Progress through Individual Effort, 95.

Proposed peace monument, 43.

Public sentiment must be educated, 8, 13, 22, 23, 33, 37, 40, 42, 43, 50, 52, 54, 57, 60, 75, 79, 97, 106, 108.

Race prejudice, 18, 22, 48.

Race sovereignty and arbitration, 36.

Reciprocity and progress, 72, 73.

Reeves, Francis B., 8.

Resolutions, 9, 67, 118.

RICHARDSON, CHARLES, 8; remarks of, 23, 38.

Rose, William J., 8.

Sankey, Ira D., 80.

SCUDDER, PRIN. MYRON T., remarks of, 65.

Seelye, Pres. L. C., 8.

Settlement of claims by diplomacy, 87, 88.

SIMMONS, J. EDWARD, 8; address of, 82.

SKINNER, HON. CHARLES R., address of, 33.

SMILEY, ALBERT K., opening remarks of, 5; 23, 37, 40, 65, 95, 104, 118, 119.

Smiley, Daniel, 8, 118.

SMILEY, SARAH F., address of, 108.

STRONG, PRES. AUGUSTUS H., address of, 24.

Stronger Sense of International Justice Needed, A, 18.

Sumner peace prizes, 45.

Talcott, James, 8.

Task of Educating Public Opinion Difficult but Imperative, 97

Teaching of Patriotism, The, 54

THAYER, HON. S. R., 8; address of, 49.

THOMAS, PRES. M. CAREY, address of, 29.

Trade Treaties and Trusts as a means of Allaying Animosities, 75.

True patriotism, 32, 47.

TRUEBLOOD, DR. BENJAMIN F., 8; address of, 9; remarks of, 38, 44, 61, 75, 86, 87, 104, 105.

Trumbull, Charles, G., 8.

Trusts and peace, 77.

Unreliability of the Commercial Forces Working Alone, 81

Unwisdom of War from a Commercial Standpoint, 78.

VAN NORDEN, WARNER, address of, 78.

Venezuelan Proclamation and Plymouth Church, 107.

Verestchagin, 20

WADHAMS, COM. A. V., remarks of, 102.

War and the press, 63.

War and trade, 76, 77.

Warlike tendencies, suppressing of, 106.

What Can Business Men Do? 74, 96.

Wilkinson, Dr. William C., 15.

Women's work for peace, 29, 35, 64.

Wood, Alexander C., 8, 24.

WOOD, JAMES, 8.

WOODRUFF, CLINTON ROGERS, 8, 23, 24; address of, 95; 105.

